LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 11 1962
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BR 350 .J69 B87 1962
Butterworth, Charles C.,
1894-1957.
George Joye, 1495?-1553

GEORGE JOYE

1495?-1553

GEORGE JOYE

1495?-1553

A Chapter in the History of the English Bible
and the English Reformation

by

CHARLES C. BUTTERWORTH

and

ALLAN G. CHESTER

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 11 1962
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Philadelphia
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

© 1962 by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

Published in Great Britain, India, and Pakistan
by the Oxford University Press
London, Bombay and Karachi

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 62-7198

Printed in Great Britain
by Fletcher & Son Ltd, Norwich

PREFACE

In two important studies, *The Literary Lineage of The King James Bible* (1941) and *The English Primers* (1953), the late Charles C. Butterworth called attention to the interest and significance of the work of George Joye in the development of the English Bible in the sixteenth century. Shortly after *The English Primers* was published, Mr Butterworth, partly at the urging of Dr J. F. Mozley and the present writer, began the preparation of a separate monograph on Joye. At his death in 1957, he had completed his studies of Joye's career down to the year 1534.

My own previous work had paralleled Mr Butterworth's in many ways. Over the years we had had long talks concerning the development of the English Bible and the history of the Reformation in England. It was quite natural that after her husband's death Mrs Butterworth should suggest that I undertake to complete the work which he had begun and publish it under our joint names. It has been a pleasure to do so.

Chapters 1 to 7 were completed by Mr Butterworth in rough draft. I have revised them for style in many places, and they have been further edited by the competent staff of the University of Pennsylvania Press, but in substance they are as he left them. On the other hand, he left only a few scattered notes relating to Joye's later career, and Chapters 8 to 15 are based entirely upon my own researches. In his earlier books Butterworth had touched upon Joye's "revisions" of Tyndale's New Testament, where my work begins, but I have thought it best, so that there would be no overlap, to study that topic afresh and write on it independently. In the two halves of the book there are probably occasional differences of tone and style but I hope no glaring inconsistencies.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge our joint indebtedness to Dr J. F. Mozley, who has always been ready to put his matchless knowledge of the English Bible and the English Reformation at our disposal. From correspondence now in my possession, I know that Mr Butterworth would wish also to express his special obligation to Dr W. A. Jackson, of the Houghton Library of Harvard University. Mr John Scheide graciously allowed me to examine his copies of the "G-H" edition of Tyndale's New Testament. To both of us, the officials of numerous libraries have been unfailingly helpful and courteous, especially those of the British Museum, the Folger Shakespeare Library, and the Library of the University of Pennsylvania. My own obligation to my wife, who has helped me in every way in this as in all my work, is far greater than could be expressed in any mere enumeration of the tasks she has performed.

ALLAN G. CHESTER.

Villanova, Pennsylvania
August 15, 1961

CONTENTS

Preface 5

Introduction 9

1 At Cambridge 15

2 Cambridge and the Reformation 23

3 Joye Leaves England 33

4 His First Translations 47

5 Mounting Controversy and Persecutions 77

6 Correspondence with England 91

7 Other Translations from the Old Testament 117

8 The New Testament 147

9 The Quarrel with Tyndale 165

10 The "Epistles" from the Old Testament 183

11 Return to England (1535–1540) 193

12 Joye and the Bishop of Winchester 205

13 Later Polemics 219

14 Daniel the Prophet 235

15 Last Years (1546–1553) 245

Appendix A 261

Appendix B 263

Appendix C 269

Bibliography 273

Index of Scriptural Citations 281

General Index 285

INTRODUCTION

If it were to be asked when the Book of Psalms was first printed in English, how many could give the answer? It is commonly known that the Psalms were translated into English during the fourteenth century, in the time of John Wycliffe, but these versions were not put into print till more than four hundred years later. It is also generally known that the first printed Bible in the English tongue was published in October 1535 in a version prepared by Myles Coverdale; and it might be natural to suppose that this epoch-making volume contained the first printing of the English Psalter. Yet, as a matter of fact, the whole Book of Psalms had already been published in English more than once before the Coverdale Bible was issued, and these first printed translations were the work of George Joye.

Who was George Joye? His name today is virtually unknown. Those familiar with the early history of the English Scriptures are usually aware that after William Tyndale published his first edition of the New Testament at Worms in 1526, and before he finished the work of revising his own version at Antwerp, certain of the Flemish printers brought out several reprints of the Worms edition, one of which was issued in August 1534 under the supervision of George Joye. It is likewise known that in this particular edition of the New Testament Joye took unwarranted liberties with the word *resurrection* as Tyndale had employed it, changing the translation of the word in certain passages without having first secured Tyndale's consent. Thereupon a quarrel broke out between the two men: Tyndale, in a preface to his revised edition when it was ready, called Joye to account for what he considered his presumptuous interference, and Joye defended himself as best he could in his *Apology*, which he put forth a few months later.

Has Joye, then, nothing more to recommend him to the consideration of posterity than his questionable ethics in republishing the text of Tyndale's New Testament? In reality the most enduring basis for Joye's reputation—that on which his claim to fame ought properly to rest—is what he himself contributed as translator and publisher of parts of the Scripture in the English tongue. He was the first to translate and publish a considerable portion of the Old Testament, namely, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations. His rendering of these books proved not to be in the direct line of tradition for accepted versions of the Bible; hence his translations were superseded. But while this may greatly diminish the importance of his contributions, it ought not to be allowed to obscure the fact that Joye was actually the first person to put forth in print an English version of that portion of the Scriptures. For it was no small accomplishment to pioneer the publication of more than a quarter of the Old Testament, especially when it is recalled that at the time of their publication these translations were as strictly forbidden as Tyndale's New Testament, or Pentateuch, or Jonah.

The way in which Joye's achievements in this field have been neglected and obscured is a subject of some interest in itself. Indeed, it is likely that his work has been ignored largely because it was considered so heretical. Until lately it has been the custom to brush aside both him and his work as inconsequential. There is a certain irony, for example, in the way Joye's name is coupled with misleading terms in two of the primary collections of source material for the history of that period. In *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*, the editor, James Gairdner, cautiously indexes Joye's name as "Joye, George, heretic"; and the fullest modern edition of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, edited by Pratt, lists him in its voluminous index as "Joye, George, Printer." Now, whether Joye was in fact a heretic depends entirely, of course, upon the point of view of the historian; but he certainly never practiced the trade of printer, even though one of his last productions was issued under his own imprint—which probably meant no more than that the book was printed under his direction and perhaps at his expense, not necessarily by his own hand. In such ways, through personal bias and misinformation, his memory has been obscured.

The progress of research into the period of the English Reformation has been persistently clearing away the debris of prejudice and neglect which has overlaid the history of certain of those early reformers, and there is now a disposition to recognize Joye's historical importance and to accord some mention, at least, to his productions. In a recent important book, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (London, 1953), Rev. J. F. Mozley painstakingly devotes part of a chapter to presenting the outstanding facts of Joye's career. Likewise in certain recent histories of the English Scriptures there is a recognition of his contribution. Still, it seems strange that the older accepted accounts of the English Bible should have had so little to say about Joye. In, for instance, Bishop Westcott's standard work, the *History of the English Bible*, the only mention of him is in connection with the Tyndale New Testaments; and in A. W. Pollard's valuable book, *The Records of the English Bible*, though quite a little space is given to Joye's part in the publication of the New Testament, nothing is said of his work on the Old Testament save for a single footnote mentioning his translation of Isaiah.

This neglect is the more extraordinary since one of the earliest writers on the history of the English Bible, Rev. John Lewis, who published his *Complete History of the Several Translations* in 1739, gave a rather full account of Joye's translations as they were known at that time. It appears that Lewis was indebted for much of his information about Joye to a learned correspondent, Daniel Waterland, D.D., who was then Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge. Waterland had acquired some first-hand knowledge of Joye's publications from the libraries at Cambridge, which were particularly rich in specimens of these once forbidden books. But after the middle of the nineteenth century it came to be the feeling, apparently, that because Joye's work as a translator was so soon displaced by the more permanent versions of Myles Coverdale, there was no need to perpetuate the memory of his part in the development of the English Bible. It is now time to repair this omission.

GEORGE JOYE

1495?-1553

I

At Cambridge

THE biographer of George Joye is constrained to acknowledge at the outset that his subject is not cast in the heroic mold. It is only honest to report that Joye was not a very great man, neither was he of pre-eminent importance. Yet he occupies an important place historically as a pioneer in the translation of the English Scriptures, and this unquestionable, if modest, post of honor ought not to be taken from him.

Joye's contribution to the Bible was literally overshadowed by the work of Tyndale and Coverdale. If we were to represent Tyndale to our imaginations as a rugged mountain peak dominating the landscape, and Coverdale as another and smaller mountain with soft and rolling contours, then Joye's place would appear between the two as a distinct but lesser prominence. So much having been said, it may still be pointed out that no description of this particular scene would be either accurate or adequate which should entirely ignore the presence of the lesser elevation by concentrating all its attention on the two loftier features.

Compared with Tyndale, Joye lacked those qualities of greatness which might have endowed his work with more permanence and, compared with Coverdale, he was deficient in the literary faculties of taste, judgment, and perception. On the other hand, what he did possess was a thorough conviction of the great need of putting the Scriptures into the common tongue so that the people might have them to read and ponder, and he had the impetus and the requisite zeal to undertake their publication in the face of many difficulties and dangers. He had also a certain freedom, a certain uninhibited fluency of style, combining informality with erudition, that makes his writing of more than passing interest as a sample of the literature of that time.

Of the details of Joye's personal life only a few can now be recovered. He had but few friends and almost no supporters. He wrote some two dozen books in all: these were published, and some of them republished, during his lifetime; but only one or two were reprinted after his death. All but a few of his works were either translations or controversial treatises. And while his translations brought him a certain amount of recognition, his controversial writings generally upheld views then considered unpopular or heretical, such as were originally expounded by the reformers, Luther, Melanchthon, or Zwingli. Secondary works such as these quickly lose their appeal, and Joye's controversies have little to recommend them to the modern reader. Composed as they were in zeal and often in hot haste, they had the unfortunate effect of alienating the support of many who might otherwise have appreciated his work in his own day.

Not only was Tyndale thus estranged from him, but so also were Sir Thomas More, Bishop Gardiner, and (to some extent) John Foxe. Moreover, by his espousal of the doctrines of the reformers he naturally called down upon himself the hostility of the established Church. Thus it may be seen that he was almost without a friend to promote his interest. The conservative prelates of the English Church disdained him as a heretic; the Roman Church saw in him both a heretic and an adversary of Sir Thomas More. On the other hand, those who were in sympathy with the reformers looked at him askance on account of his quarrel with Tyndale; while the modern unbiased historian has had to depend largely upon the records of John Foxe, whom Joye in his later years antagonized. Joye also managed to escape the arduous glory of a martyr's death; consequently Foxe alludes to his accomplishments with something less than enthusiasm.

One of his very few supporters—one whose account of him is, though short, a valuable source of information—was John Bale. Like Joye, he was himself both heretic and zealot, and perhaps for this very reason had some sympathetic appreciation of what Joye was attempting to do. At any rate, in his famous catalogue of early English writers, the *Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum summarium*, Bale concludes his brief account of Joye with the tribute that he was a loyal and vigorous advocate of the truth ("fidelis ac robustus veritatis assertor").

By reconstruction of the known evidence, the date of Joye's birth can be reckoned at about 1494 or 1495, which would make him nearly of an age with William Tyndale. He is known to have been born in Bedfordshire, doubtless in the little village of Renhold, which lies some three miles to the northeast of the county town of Bedford. In earlier times the name of the parish was variously recorded as Ronhale or Renhall; and when, in 1515, Joye was ordained a priest, his name appears on the register of the Bishop of Lincoln as "Georgius Ioye de Rownhall." Of his childhood nothing whatever is known. During his early life, the chief residence in the parish was Renhold Manor, in the possession of the Latimers and Nevills. Another prominent family occupied Salphobury Manor. The parish church, too, was no doubt known to Joye, since it had been built in the preceding century; in fact, one of the tombs still standing in the church, that of Edmund Wayte, was erected in 1518.[1]

Among the foremost families of the county one of the most ancient was the St Johns of Bletsoe, whose ancestral seat was located about six miles to the northwest of Bedford; and it is through a letter written by Sir John St John that we come upon the earliest recorded fact in Joye's career. Sir John's mother had been Margaret Beauchamp, who by her second marriage became the mother of the illustrious Lady Margaret Beaufort. This latter Margaret was not only the grandmother of Henry VIII, but also the patron and founder of two colleges in the University of Cambridge: Christ's, which was established in 1505, and St John's, founded six years later.

On April 25, 1522, Sir John St John of Bletsoe wrote a letter to

Henry Gold, who was a fellow of St John's College as well as chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and at the end of this letter there is a passing reference to George Joye.[2] As half-brother to the Lady Margaret, Sir John would naturally have been a person of some consequence to the administrators of the two Beaufort foundations at Cambridge. He appears to have stood patron for a few promising students, starting them on their academic careers by having them enrolled as scholars. This particular letter Sir John wrote on behalf of one Robert Smith, "the whych ys dyssposyd to be a prest and wyll labur him selfe to have conyng [i.e., *cunning*, or *knowledge*]." He asks that young Smith be boarded in St John's until there is word of some vacancy in Christ's College, "trystyng then to gett thys yong man to be a scholar there." Whereupon Sir John adds: "I hand non theyr seth mast*er* Jorge Gee was myttyd a scholar ther as knowyth you."

Like many another prominent personage of that day, Sir John was plainly accustomed to have his own way in spelling the English tongue: "hand" is for *had* (or *hadn't*); "seth" is for *since*; and "myttyd" of course is for *admitted*. So we need not take it amiss that Joye's name here appears as "Jorge Gee." We shall encounter it later in such varying forms as "Iay", "Jaye", and "Gye."

The records of Joye's university career are very scanty indeed. Assuming that he was entered at Cambridge as a scholar of Christ's College, the exact year of his entry remains unknown. From the so-called Grace Books, it is still uncertain whether he qualified for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1513 or 1514. One pertinent entry in 1513 says that he was granted admission to the examination for this degree by virtue of his having had ten terms of formal instruction, in spite of his enforced absence from another four terms.[3] Such adjustments were not uncommon at that period: perhaps Joye had not the requisite financial backing to enable him to fulfil all the academic requirements without interruption; though it is also to be recalled that occasionally during term time the University was all but deserted as a result of the plague, whose excessive violence now and then drove students and faculty alike to take refuge in the country.

Allowing three terms to a year, we reach the conclusion that Joye must have been entered in either 1508 or 1509, just before young Henry VIII acceded to the English throne. It is likely that he transferred his enrollment from Christ's to the ancient foundation of Peterhouse while he was still an undergraduate. The Grace Books also tell us that in 1517 he was admitted to the degree of Master of Arts and was known as "Inceptor in arte", on the strength of his having completed another nine terms "in forma." And on April 27 of the same year he was made a fellow of "Peter College," an honor which he always highly regarded and to which he more than once refers.

Meanwhile, on March 3, 1515, "Georgius Ioye de Rownhall" was ordained as a subdeacon at Newnham Priory in Bedfordshire, and three weeks later he was ordained priest for Humberston Abbey in Lincolnshire. Whether he entered upon any active duties in the latter post is doubtful, but we do hear something further of his connection with Newnham Priory. That ancient monastic house, no longer extant, is described by Joye as "besides Bedford," and was located along the river Ouse, about a mile east of the town. Until the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry's regime, it was a priory of some standing in the community. It had holdings in Joye's native town of Renhold: as early as 1170 the parish allotted "half a hide" (about fifty acres) to the support of Newnham Priory, and the parish church of Renhold was also under its jurisdiction. The prior of Newnham in Joye's day was John Ashwell, of whom we shall hear again.

There is preserved a mutilated list of the faculty and students at the University of Cambridge about 1522. The list may have been compiled on the occasion of Henry VIII's visit to Cambridge in that year. In any event, it records the name of "Geo. Joye" among the "Artium professores" or "fellows" of Peterhouse.[4] The Master of Peterhouse is given as "Guilelmus Burgoyne," who was succeeded in the latter part of 1522 by John Edmunds.

The University Grace Books give us the information that a "Master Gee" was licenced as "Predicator" or preacher in the year 1521-22. This probably refers to Joye and would have given him the privilege of preaching in and around the university. It is evident that he was earnest in pursuit of his theological studies during his residence at Cambridge, for in the year 1525 he took his last degree, that of Bachelor of Divinity. Concerning his studies all we know is the observation of Bale that he was skilled in Latin and Greek and that he "set his hand to the plough" of the heavenly learning of Christ instead of "wasting his time over the foolishness of Aristotle (*in Aristotelicis delirijs non consenuit*)."

All in all, we may suppose that aside from occasional visits to Bedfordshire and Newnham Priory, Joye resided at the university in term time during most of his stay there, from the beginning of 1509 to the end of 1527 when he left his native land. These years coincide with one of the most stirring periods of English history.

In the first place, in the university itself great building activity was going forward. Not only could Joye have watched the completion of the first court of Christ's College, which was finished about 1511, but he could also have seen three of the foremost examples of Cambridge architecture come into their glory: the stonework of King's College Chapel, with its exquisite fan-vaulting, was completed in 1515, and the famous stained-glass windows were installed during the years that followed; the brick entrance gate of St John's, generally reputed the handsomest in Cambridge, was built in 1510 and 1516; and the great gate of Trinity, then known as King's Hall, was erected between 1519 and 1525.

Whether Joye was old enough to have profited by the instruction of the great Dutch scholar, Erasmus of Rotterdam, is uncertain. But Erasmus was established at Cambridge in Queens' College from 1511 to 1514, teaching Greek to the few scholars who came to his classes and complaining of the climate and living conditions to his friends and correspondents. While Joye never attained much proficiency in Greek, it is probable that during the first year of his studies for his Master's degree he would have been made aware of Erasmus' influence. He may even have known that Erasmus was at work, during these Cambridge years, on the edition of the Greek New Testament which he published at Basel early in 1516, some eighteen months after leaving England. In this famous edition—the first to be published, though not the first actually printed—the Greek text was set forth in parallel columns with a Latin version which frequently diverged from the accepted readings in the Vulgate, especially in the Epistles of St Paul;[5] and by the time a second edition was ready in 1519, Erasmus had prepared a Latin version that showed still further departures from the Vulgate, as well as a much more elaborate apparatus of prefatory matter, tables, "arguments," etc. In view of the fame of Erasmus, it is certain that these great developments would have made a particular impression on the students at Cambridge.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

[1] See *The Victoria Histories of the Counties of England: Bedfordshire* (III, 215 ff.)

[2] An abstract of this letter is given in *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, Vol. III, No. 2198.

[3] For this and subsequent references to the Grace Books, see Mary Bateson, ed., *Grace Book Beta*, Part II, pp. 15, 35, 55, 99, 122; and William G. Searle, ed., *Grace Book Gamma*, pp. 103, 146.

[4] The entire list of fellows at Peterhouse, arranged apparently in order of seniority, is given as: John Grayne [or, Crane], Ric. Franke, John Coore, Wm. Rolston, Geo. Joye, Robt. Shether, Wm. Bukmaister, Chr. Kyngiston, Hen. Godbalde, Thos. Williams, Thos. Gylbert, Thos. Brashawe. Buckmaster became Vice-Chancellor in 1529. See *Letters and Papers*, Addenda, Vol. I, Part 1, No. 357.

[5] In the interesting copy of the 1516 edition in the New York Public Library the Latin version has faint underscorings in a reddish ink where it diverges from the Vulgate. At the end of each book a spidery hand has recorded the date of these comparisons, beginning with January 1517. See C. C. Butterworth, "Erasmus and Bilney and Foxe", *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LVII (1953), 575.

2

Cambridge and the Reformation

MEANWHILE, in Germany, an event had taken place which was to outstrip in importance all other events of the period: a young Augustinian friar, Martin Luther, had openly, and in writing, protested the authority of the Pope in the matter of issuing indulgences. This was in November 1517, at the time when Joye was just settling into his first year as a fellow of Peterhouse. How long it took for the impact of the new Lutheran doctrines to make itself felt in Cambridge we do not know; but at least by 1520, and perhaps earlier, the "new learning" (as it was called)[1] began to be discussed among the young divinity students in the university.

Historians are impressed with the lively part that Cambridge played in fomenting the Reformation in England. Indeed, the roster of the Cambridge reformers reads like a catalogue of the principal actors. Tyndale had come thither to study in 1518 or 1519, having previously taken his Bachelor's and Master's degrees at Oxford. Coverdale also was living in the immediate vicinity, having assumed the vows of an Augustinian friar. Other famous figures of the English Reformation who were at Cambridge during Joye's residence there included Thomas Cranmer, a fellow of Jesus College, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; Hugh Latimer, fellow of Clare, afterward Bishop of Worcester; Robert Barnes, prior of the Augustinian house where Coverdale resided; and Thomas Bilney, fellow of Trinity Hall, of whom Foxe records that it was the illumination that came to him through Erasmus' rendering of a verse in I Timothy (1 : 15)[2] which started him on his way as a religious reformer. Except for Coverdale and Joye, all of these eventually became martyrs in the cause of reform. Other Cambridge students who gained a martyr's crown, and whom Joye might have known, were Richard Bayfield, John Frith, John Rogers, John Lambert, Nicholas Ridley, and Thomas Dusgate. Still others became dignitaries of the Church: Nicholas Shaxton, of Gonville Hall, became Bishop of Salisbury; Stephen Gardiner, of Trinity Hall, Bishop of Winchester; Edward Fox, of King's College, Bishop of Hereford; John Bale, of Jesus College, Bishop of Ossory; Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster; and John Hilsey and Nicholas Heath, Bishops of Rochester. These future bishops were all Joye's contemporaries. Among his juniors, George Day, who was a fellow at St John's in 1522, became Bishop of Chichester, and Matthew Parker, who was made fellow of Corpus Christi in 1527, the year Joye left Cambridge, went on to become Archbishop of Canterbury and the promoter of the Bishops' Bible.

It is not necessary to assume that Joye knew all these men personally; but he might have had opportunity to know any one of them, and it is certain that he knew many. One, for instance, was George Stafford, fellow of Pembroke, an influential figure among the young reformers. It was he who, with Bilney, turned the thoughts of Robert Barnes to the authority of the Scriptures and induced him to proclaim the "new learning." Likewise Joye might have had opportunity at Cambridge to get acquainted with a couple of students who later crossed the Channel and assisted Tyndale, namely, William Roye and George Constantine. But of Joye's personal activities in these Cambridge days the record is blank, save for the general observation by Bale, that "while still in his prime, as the light of truth dawned upon him, he [Joye] set his hand to the plough of heavenly learning; for from the purest fonts of the Gospels did he drink the spiritual and wholly undiluted philosophy of Christ, with which he bedewed the parched hearts of many."[3] From this it seems logical to conclude that Joye embraced the doctrines of the reformers comparatively early in his career—say, about 1523 or 1524.

That certain young men of Cambridge were being touched by the "new learning" seeping in from Lutheran strongholds in Germany, and particularly by the doctine which Erasmus himself had helped to inculcate, that the Scriptures ought to be familiar to the common man and available in his native language—all this, of course, was not unobserved by the authorities. During the ascendancy of Cardinal Wolsey the importation of Lutheran books into England became an issue of great consequence. It was in 1520 that Luther published three of his most outspoken treatises, defining his stand in opposition to that of the Roman Church, and before the end of that year Luther's books were declared heretical by the English clergy. The King himself took up the cudgels against Luther and in the following May vindicated his own orthodoxy by publishing an anti-Lutheran treatise on the Seven Sacraments. In recognition of this service, Pope Leo X bestowed on Henry the hereditary title of "Defender of the Faith." The older bishops of the Church of England, particularly those in the vulnerable eastern counties—Nix of Norwich, Longland of Lincoln, and West of Ely—were determined to stamp out heresy if possible; and on the twelfth of May, 1521, there was a public burning of Lutheran books in St Paul's churchyard, over which Cardinal Wolsey presided. For this occasion John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester and friend of Erasmus, preached a learned sermon against the heresy of Martin Luther. Since Fisher had long been Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, the import of this affair was certainly not lost upon the students there.

These developments were doubtless a topic of eager discussion among the younger men in the university. Foxe is authority for the statement that certain of the bolder spirits used to gather informally at the White Horse Inn in Cambridge.[4] Speaking of the experiences of Robert Barnes, Foxe writes:

> Then the seacreat [i.e., *secret*] learned in Christ both of Penbroke Hall, Saint Jones, Peter House, Quenes Colledge, the Kinges Colledge Gounwell Hall, & Benet Colledge shewed them selues, and flocked together in open sight, both in the scoles, & at open sermondes, at S. Maries, and at the Austens & all

> other disputations. And then they co*n*ferred co*n*tinually together, & the house that they resorted to most co*m*monly was the white horse, which for spite of the*m* to bring gods word into co*n*te*m*pt was called Germany, & that house was chosen because of the*m* of S. Jones. The kinges Colledge & the Quenes colledge came in on y*e* backe side, for the*n* muche trouble bega*n* to ensue....

In later editions, after 1576, the last sentence was amended to read: "This house especially was chosen because many of them of St John's, the King's college, and the Queens' college, came in on the back side."

No records have been preserved of these gatherings, and the tavern itself long ago disappeared. It stood where the present King's Lane leads off King's Parade, north of the site of the Bull Inn, and extended back to a little thoroughfare, no longer in existence, which in Archbishop Parker's plan of Cambridge in 1547 was known as "Plott and Nuts Lane" and which continued the line of Benet Street towards Queens' Lane. The reader should be cautioned, perhaps, that the quotation from the *Acts and Monuments* given above is the *only* known contemporary reference to these meetings at the White Horse; hence it is the basis on which all subsequent conjectures have been raised. It has become fashionable to allude to the place as a sort of Mermaid Tavern such as flourished in Ben Jonson's time, or a sort of news center like the coffee-houses of Addison's day; but these figments of the historian's imagination have no support beyond what may be reasonably inferred from Foxe's few words.[5]

The "seacreat learned" (as they were called in the 1563 edition) were described as the "godly learned" in later editions, but who they were we must gather by conjecture. They were certainly reformers, and the list of colleges that Foxe enumerates can furnish us a few hints. At Pembroke, in the 1520's, were George Stafford, John Thixtel, and John Clark, and among younger men, Nicholas Ridley and John Rogers. From St John's would certainly have come Thomas Arthur and perhaps George Day. From Peterhouse, the only attendant, so far as we know, would have been George Joye. From Queens' College there was John Lambert (alias Nicholson) and perhaps the President of the College, Dr Farman or Forman, whom Foxe mentions by name as having befriended the reformers. From King's might have come Edward Fox, whom Joye knew personally, and Ralph Bradford, and perhaps young John Frith. Gonville Hall—specially singled out by the Bishop of Norwich as savoring of the "frying-pan"—might have been represented by Edward Crome, Nicholas Shaxton, and Simon Smith; while Corpus Christi, then known as Benet Hall, might have sent Richard Bayfield or possibly, among the younger men, Matthew Parker and Richard Taverner, depending on how long the sessions at the White Horse were kept up. No actual dates are given for any of these meetings: probably they were occasional and very informal gatherings, but presumably they would have occurred between the years 1523 and 1528. Foxe says nothing of Jesus College, where were Thomas Cranmer and John Bale; nor does he mention Trinity Hall, though there is some likelihood that Stephen Gardiner mingled in the discussions of the group at least occasionally.

From Trinity Hall also would have come Thomas Bilney, one of the foremost of the early reformers. He it was who converted both Arthur and Latimer to the "new learning," with quiet intensity presenting to them the convictions he had gained from a study of the Gospels. Hugh Latimer, after his conversion in 1524, was on the friendliest terms with the reformers. Robert Barnes was perhaps the most vocal of the group, and as prior of the Cambridge house of "the Austens" (as Foxe calls them) it was he who persuaded Coverdale to throw in his lot with the party of reform. It is doubtful if Tyndale stayed at Cambridge long enough to join in these informal gatherings, but he was one of the first to take his stand and he may have made his influence felt. He departed from the university about 1521 or 1522, to take up residence in Gloucestershire as a tutor and there to ponder his mission of translating the New Testament.

For one of the primary convictions which united this earnest group of young Cambridge theologians was the need for a wider dissemination of the Scriptures in the tongue of the common people. In 1522 Luther had produced for the German people a vernacular version of the New Testament, and about the same time Tyndale was telling a "learned man" in Gloucestershire: "Ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost." Erasmus had said much the same thing, only more elaborately, in the preface to his first edition of the Greek New Testament. As this famous passage was translated into English in 1529,[6] it read:

> I wold desire that all women shuld reade the gospell and Paules epistles/ and I wolde to god they were translated in to the tonges of all men/ So that they might not only be read/ and knowne/ of the scotes and yryshmen/ But also of the Turkes and sarracenes/ ... I wold to god/ *ye* plowma*n* wolde singe a texte of the scripture at his plowbeme/ And that the wever at his lowme/ with this wold driue away the tediousness of tyme. I wold the wayfaringe man with this pasty*me*/ wold expelle the werynes of his iorney. And to be shorte I wold that all the communication of the christen shuld be of the scripture/ for in a maner soch are we our selves/ as oure daylye tales are.

When Tyndale set out for London in the summer of 1523 for the purpose of gaining the assent of Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, to the translation of the Greek New Testament into English, this move must surely have come to the ears of the students at Cambridge. And when, in the spring of 1524, he left England for Hamburg, having secured the backing of some London merchants but not the approval of the Bishop, this too would have been known in Cambridge. Finally, when in the autumn of 1525 Tyndale was forced to flee from Cologne to Worms with the unfinished sheets of his first quarto attempt to print the New Testament, the sympathies of the Cambridge reformers must have been deeply stirred.

Meanwhile these young heretics began to feel the weight of official disapproval. Robert Barnes had taken his degree of D.D. in 1523; Thomas Arthur had taken his B.D. the same year; George Stafford and Hugh Latimer had taken theirs in 1524; and Joye his in 1525. By this time there were already rumors that Cambridge was being infected with the Lutheran heresy: in 1523 certain of the bishops reported to Cardinal Wolsey that some of the Cambridge colleges were suspected of harboring devotees of the "new learning." Wolsey forbore to act; but with Fisher as Chancellor of the university, and with Nix and Longland as bishops of the neighboring dioceses of Norwich and Lincoln, it was inevitable that offenses would come; for it has seldom been possible to hold reform in check by treating it as heresy. The first round of open hostilities was begun by Friar Barnes, now Dr Barnes, who in a provocative sermon at Cambridge on Christmas Eve, 1525, went so far as to make disparaging allusions, oblique but unmistakable, to the behavior of Thomas Wolsey, the Cardinal.

Thereupon the Vice-Chancellor of the university, Edmund Natares, having found witnesses to testify that Barnes's utterances seemed to them heretical, took the preacher to task and had him examined for heresy. For a few weeks there was much argument back and forth, Barnes insisting that nothing he had said could be considered heretical if construed in the light of Christian charity. At length the examiners drew up a formal revocation for Barnes to sign, but this he refused to do. According to his own account:

> Nowe whan I had this thyng in wrytyng, I called in to my chambre, an eyght, or tenne, of the best lerned men, that were in Ca*m*bryge, the whiche be yet alyue, as farre as I knowe, sauyng mayster George Stafforde, & mayster Bylney. Of all these I asked theyr counsell, what they thoughte best to do, seynge this reuocation was so vncharitably made, & thynges falsely layde to my charge, whiche were not in my articles, nor yet coulde be charytably taken out of them. They all concluded, that it was neyther ryght, nor co*n*science, that I shulde agree to this reuocation.

This passage was written in 1534,[7] and Barnes did not wish to implicate by name any of his friends who were still alive. But we cannot help wondering whether Joye was one of the eight or ten "best lerned men" who were present that night in Barnes's chamber.

In the outcome, Barnes was cited to the Cardinal for heresy. Wolsey acted promptly and dispatched agents to the university to apprehend Barnes and to round up all the Lutheran literature they could lay their hands on. Early in February, 1526, Barnes was brought to trial for heresy before an ecclesiastical commission in London. He decided to recant, however, so that his life was spared for the time; but he was imprisoned and was also forced to undergo the public humiliation of carrying his fagot and casting it on the fire that had been specially kindled at Paul's Cross for the burning of Lutheran books. And again Bishop Fisher was engaged to preach an appropriate sermon.[8]

Fortunately for Barnes's friends and sympathizers at Cambridge, the Cardinal's agents discovered but few heretical books there, for all their pains. The President of Queens' College, Thomas Farman,[9] spread the word that the agents were on their way to Cambridge, so that there was opportunity to hide most of the forbidden books from the scrutiny of the investigators. Apparently some of the reform group, Joye among them, were questioned by the university authorities, but no further action was taken for the present.

It was evidently this very time of stress, in February 1526, that Joye referred to when in after years he wrote a book attacking the position of Stephen Gardiner, who had meanwhile become Bishop of Winchester. Joye complains that in earlier days, before Gardiner became so eminent, he had not been unfriendly to the element of reform, and recalls that Gardiner had spoken a good word for him at the time when he had been brought before Dr Robert Shirton, then Master of Pembroke and dean of the Cardinal's chapel, and before Dr William Capon, Master of Jesus College, who was also Wolsey's almoner.[10] Joye writes:

> When I was brought before doctor Shirton dean of the cardinals chapell and before doctour capon his almonor sent to cambridge to enquire for vs that professed the gospell and for our bokes, you [Gardiner] standing by them at the cupborde in peter college aule [i.e., *hall*] did speak for me & for my bokes as by name for pseugmata Chrisost vpon Gnes. [i.e., *Chrysostom upon Genesis*] which Ihon Oecolampadius had translated, And gaue vs both your

> good word, so that I kept the boke stil. And what fauourable letters afterwarde ye wrote to maister George Stafforde to geue hym warninge when he was complained of to the cardinall for readynge and declaringe truely and faithfully the pistle to the Romains & shewed him howe he shulde temper his lection in vtteringe the truth and excuse him selfe, &c. I knowe it, and remember it all. For maister George didde euer shewe me your letters.

The gathering storm was allayed only for a time. Stafford gained quite a reputation for his lectures on St Paul, expounding the text of the Scripture itself rather than the comments of learned doctors upon it, and according to Foxe he was instrumental in bringing many to an appreciation of the "new learning." At the height of his fame in 1529, though spared from formal accusations of heresy, he was carried off by the plague. He was apparently about Joye's age and, had he lived, would have been one of the most illustrious of the English reformers.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

[1] The term "new learning", as used in the sixteenth century, meant the new teaching, the new religious doctrines, emanating from Luther and his followers. It carried a certain derogatory connotation. Much later, in the middle of the nineteenth century, the term was employed as a synonym for the Revival of Learning, that is, the revival of classical studies. The classical term for this revival was *bonae literae*, or good learning, not far removed from the modern *belles lettres*. An early instance of "new learning" meaning the reformed doctrines is found in Tyndale's preface to the old work which he edited, called "The Prayer and Complaint of the Plowman unto Christ" (*S.T.C.* 20036). The preface is dated February 28, 1531. For further discussion, see A. G. Chester, "The 'New Learning': a Semantic Note," *Studies in the Renaissance*, II (1955), 139-47.

[2] It is noteworthy that in the Latin text of Bilney's letter to Cuthbert Tunstall, as Foxe prints it (see the Pratt edition of his *Acts and Monuments*, IV, 633), the wording of this verse from I Timothy agrees exactly with the version contained in the 1516 and 1519 editions of Erasmus' New Testament. See also the article in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* cited above.

[3] Bale's *Illustrium Scriptorum Summarium*, 1548 ed., fol. 239^{v}. See Appendix A.

[4] *Acts and Monuments*, 1563 ed, p. 601. N.B. The numbering of the pages immediately preceding is confused.

[5] For samples of recent unwarranted enlargements on the White Horse Inn, see H. M. Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (pp. 252-255); L. B. Smith, *Tudor*

Prelates and Politics (pp. 32-34); and M. L. Loane, *Masters of the English Reformation* (p. 10). Strype's mention of the tavern in his *Life of Matthew Parker* (p. 6), is plainly based on Foxe's wording. For records of the site, known in the fifteenth century as the Fordham place, see G. F. Browne, "On the site of the White Horse, or 'Germany,'" in *Communications* [*Proceedings*] *of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, III, (1879), 407.

[6] *An exhortation to the diligent studye of scripture* (*S.T.C.* 10493, fol. *5).

[7] See his *Supplicacion unto henrye the eyght*, printed by Byddell in November 1534 (fol. H3^v). The earlier edition of 1531 (*S.T.C.* 1470) omits this entire section, which is headed "¶ The hole disputacion betwene the byshops and doctour Barnes."

[8] For discussion of this event see A. G. Chester, "Robert Barnes and the Burning of the Books," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XIV (1951), 211.

[9] There is much difficulty over this man's name: it appears as Farman, Ferman, and Forman; his first name as Thomas, Robert, and Stephen. Foxe cites the name as Farmer, which his editor changes to Forman. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* identifies Robert Forman, President of Queens', with Robert Forman, rector of All-Hallows Church in Honey Lane, London; but the *Grace Book Gamma* records degrees granted to Thomas Farman, who was also professor of theology and auditor of accounts in the university for the year 1524.

[10] *The refutation of the byshop of Winchesters derke declaration* (1546), fol. M1.

3

Joye Leaves England

At the same time that Robert Barnes was compelled to bear his fagot at the public burning of heretical books on February 11, 1526, five other men, German merchants residing in London, were subjected to a like humiliation. These five were members of a company of Hanseatic traders who had their headquarters in London at the so-called Steelyard.[1] For a great many years merchants from the Hanseatic cities had enjoyed special privileges in England for the stimulation of foreign trade. Now, with the spread of Lutheranism in their homeland, they were in a position to function also as convenient agents in the traffic in forbidden books.

The Peasants' War had raged with great violence in certain parts of Germany from the summer of 1524 to the spring of 1525. The excesses which accompanied it, both on the part of the nobles and of the common people, were attributed by many Englishmen to the growth of Lutheran heresy; so much so, that those about Luther at Wittenberg felt constrained to address a general epistle to "the Christians" in England, explaining in simple terms the basis of the "new learning" and asking that the doctrines should not be judged by the shortcomings of the professors thereof. Such a letter, written by John Bugenhagen, was printed at Wittenberg about February, 1525, in both a Latin and a German edition.[2] It was apparently intended to quiet the misgivings of sympathizers who, like the merchants of the Steelyard, though they received "the joyful message of the glory of God" (as the letter puts it), were now ready to "draw back again because of unknown rumors that there be raised of us by them that withstand the gospel of God."

Before the end of 1525 it was known in England that an Englishman in the Lutheran portion of Germany was putting forth a translation of the New Testament. Indeed, knowledge of Tyndale's activity may have been what prompted Barnes to think the time was ripe for him to preach as he did at Cambridge on Christmas Eve, when he made the allusion to Wolsey described in the preceding chapter. Word of the impending New Testament also aroused the bishops to renew their vigilance against the circulation of heretical books. In the absence of Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, who was on a diplomatic mission in Spain, two publishers in his diocese were summoned before his vicar-general on December 19 for having printed and circulated a book called *The Image of Love*, which inveighed against the worship of images and saints. Early in January, 1526, the King gave his sanction to a plan to confiscate Lutheran books and burn them publicly, with the result that Wolsey set in motion two parties of searchers: one, as we have seen, was sent to Cambridge; the other to the merchants of the Steelyard.

On March 3, the Hanse merchants in London wrote a letter, which was printed and of which a few copies are still extant,[3] recounting to their brethren, the burgomaster and town council of Cologne, what had been going forward in the Steelyard. On January 27, the letter reports, Sir Thomas More and two "doctors" (meaning churchmen) had come to the Steelyard with authority from the Cardinal to search the merchants' rooms for Lutheran books, and had carried off such Testaments and prayer books as they could find, whether in German or French.[4] They had also told some of the most prominent members ("der adelsten") to report to Westminster and bring along with them one Helbert Billendorp. These men were laid under heavy fine and forbidden to leave England for the next twenty days. Later the aldermen of the company appeared before Wolsey to complain of this restriction, and to discuss the subject of imports and of what sort of identifying livery the merchants were to wear. They were warned that any books they imported must first be shown to the two "doctors." Billendorp was one of those who did penance along with Barnes at the public book-burning.

It must have been just about this time that Tyndale, with William Roye to assist him in the copying and proofreading, completed the first edition of the New Testament at Worms; for the first copies of this precious volume seem to have been smuggled into England during the spring of 1526.

Meanwhile Luther had drafted a letter to King Henry VIII, belittling the attack that Henry had made on him some years before and suggesting that some common ground might be found between them by reason of their zeal in behalf of the Gospel. Though written at the beginning of September, 1525, Luther's letter was not formally received by the King until March 20, 1526. Perhaps the delay was purposeful, so that its official arrival would lend some support to the forthcoming English edition of the New Testament.

The King composed a rejoinder complaining that Luther had seen fit to publish his letter before it had been delivered officially in England, and scouting the idea that there could be agreement between himself and such a notorious heretic. The receipt of this reply was acknowledged by the English representative in Germany at the end of November 1526. In the preface to an English edition of his reply, published early in 1527, Henry refers to Luther as having encouraged "one or two leude p*er*sons/ borne in this our realme/ for the translatyng of the Newe testament in to Englysshe."[5]

The English clergy also were not idle. The King specifically mentions in his preface that he consulted with the Cardinal and certain of the clergy concerning what was to be done about the New Testaments. Tunstall had come home from Spain in the spring of 1526 and was doubtless one of those who took part in the discussions held during that summer. On September 3, one John Saddler, a Londoner living in the parish of Lothbury, wrote a letter to Richard Harman, an English merchant residing in the city of Antwerp, telling him that the news was that the English New Testament was going to be burnt.[6] And so it turned out.

Some decisive stand by the clergy was rendered even more imperative by the activity of certain Flemish printers, particularly Christopher Van Endhoven, who began to bring out reprints of Tyndale's translation. Tunstall led the way in stopping this influx of forbidden books. On October 24 he issued injunctions to the clergy in his diocese, ordering their parishioners to bring in to the Bishop's vicar "all and singular such books containing the translation of the New Testament in the English tongue." And the next day he summoned the booksellers of London before him and warned them not to sell or distribute any Lutheran books, in either Latin or English, until they had first been submitted to Cardinal Wolsey or himself for inspection. Lastly, on an appointed Sunday (probably either October 28 or November 4) there was another public burning of books, this time of such copies of Tyndale's New Testament as had already been confiscated. Bishop Tunstall preached a special sermon for the occasion, calling attention to the "heresies" that were implanted in the new version.

But these book-burnings served only to fire the zeal of the reformers. For the distributors of the New Testament had not been idle either. For example, Robert Barnes, who had been confined in Fleet prison since February, was allowed after some six months to be transferred to the house of the Augustinian friars in London; and here, though still under surveillance, he managed to be active in promoting the circulation of the English New Testaments. Among those who later confessed that they had bought forbidden books through Barnes were John Tyball, of Steeple Bumstead in Essex, and T. Hilles of Wytham.[7] Their depositions vary as to when the transactions took place, but one said it was about Michaelmas time (September 30) when they had interviewed Barnes, and this would accord with the statement that he had been kept in Fleet prison for about six months.

All through the early part of 1527 feverish efforts were made, without success, to apprehend Tyndale somewhere in Germany, and thus check the flow of New Testaments. We hear of him briefly at Worms during the spring of 1527, some twelve months after his helper, William Roye, had left him and had settled for a while at Strassburg.

Meanwhile new events were preparing. In April of 1527 King Henry VIII was beginning seriously to question the legality of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, who had been his loyal queen since the year of his accession to the throne. In May, the city of Rome was sacked by the soldiers of the Emperor, Charles V, and the Pope was held a prisoner. These historic events led ultimately to the turning of the tide in favor of those who were circulating the English Scriptures: for out of the first came eventually the separation of the Church of England from that of Rome; and out of the second came increasing distrust of the papal claims to supremacy and infallibility. But the shadow of these changes was not yet apparent, and renewed persecutions of the reformers continued for another several years.

With Robert Barnes's movements still restricted to a virtual house-imprisonment, it was Thomas Bilney who next stepped forth to challenge the clerical authorities. During May and June of 1527 he set out with his friend and disciple, Thomas Arthur, on a sort of preaching mission, which took them as far as London. Witnesses were not wanting who charged that both these men uttered heresies in their sermons. The preparation of the charges consumed some months, but at length, on November 23, Cardinal Wolsey dispatched official letters to Cambridge summoning both of them to London to stand trial before a commission of bishops. The trial lasted from November 27 until December 7, when each of the men separately consented to sign a statement abjuring the articles of heresy which had been laid against him. Bilney appears to have been imprisoned for a year or so, but Arthur was let go on condition that he preach no more. The latter thenceforth turned his attention to tutoring until his death in 1532.

On the same twenty-third of November a summons was also sent to George Joye at Cambridge, commanding him in the Cardinal's name to present himself at London on November 27, 1527. Joye himself has recounted what took place, and from his record it appears that the charges against him were formulated by his superior at Newnham Priory in Bedford. For some time John Ashwell, the prior, had been sounding out Joye's views on various questions and reporting them to his superior, John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln. Joye complains that the prior invited him to stay at his house on purpose; he writes:[8]

> [You] shewed me vtwordly a fayer flateringe co*n*tenaunce desyeri*n*ge me ofte to abyde which [*sic*; for *with*] you: but (as I nowe perceaue) all was to honte oute somwhat of me wherby you might th*us* Judasly betraye me/ & so do your spiritual father & other/ sich a secrete sacrifice.

Presumably, this went on during the long vacation of 1527, and by the autumn Prior Ashwell had come to the point where he could write letters alleging four heretical opinions which he asserted were held by Joye. Accordingly the Bishop of Lincoln had the Cardinal include Joye's name in the summons to come to London and be examined before the bishops along with Bilney and Arthur.

How Joye was able to procure copies of the letters which Ashwell sent to Bishop Longland we do not know; but perhaps it was through the good offices of Stephen Gardiner, who (according to Joye) had the letters.[9] At any rate, Ashwell is quoted as having written to the Bishop of Lincoln in this style during that year of 1527:

> Also where as my lorde your suffraga*n* informed your lordscip of on [i.e., *one*] master gye [Joye] by the knowlege that he had of me what erroneus opinions he hylde: forsothe sume be oute of my minde/ & sume I hane called to my minde by the reson of your letters.

Evidently, then, the prior reported to the suffragan and the suffragan to the bishop, who thereupon wanted some written confirmation from Ashwell. The latter continues:

> Also M[aster] chawnceler [i.e., the Bishop's chancellor, Dr. Raynes] made serche for hi*m* [Joye] diuerse times whe*n* he came into the co*n*tre [i.e.,

> Bedfordshire] but then he was euer at Ca*m*brig i*n* Peter house. And M. chawnceler gaue vnto me strett [i.e., *strait, strict*] co*m*maundeme*n*t i*n* your lordship name that I shulde not suffer hi*m* [Joye] to preche in no*n* of owr chirches with out your licens & writing with your sealle/ & so he come nomore at me/ nor I pray to god that he do not except he ame*n*d.

To this Ashwell added certain gossip that he had heard about Joye:

> More ouer I haue harde sume reporte that whe*n* he [Joye] haue ben amo*n*g lay p*er*sons at festis or yo*n*keres [i.e., *youngsters*] in the cowntre he hath had mani lewde opinio*n*s amo*n*g the pepolle & some good folkis wolde murmur a*n*d grugge [i.e., *grudge*] at his saynges & some wolde reioyse them.[10]

The four opinions that were cited against Joye as heresies were these, as given in Joye's words:

> ¶ The firste opinion is (as M[aster] pryour sayth) that a simple priest hath as large a*n*d as grete powr to bynde and to lose/ as hath a bishope/ or the Bishope of Rome.
>
> ¶ The seco*n*d that he i*m*puteth vnto me is y*t* faithe is sufficie*n*t without werkes.
>
> ¶ The thirde that he fayneth on me/ is that euery priest maye haue a wyfe or a concubine.
>
> ¶ The fowerth/ that euery laye man maye heare confessions.[11]

Without going at this time into Joye's replies to these allegations, we may glance briefly at one part of his discussion of the third charge, concerning the vexed question whether priests should be allowed to marry; for in his remarks on this point we get a unique glimpse of Joye against the background of Newnham Priory. He is describing how Prior Ashwell sounded him out on this topic of clerical celibacy:

> Yow tolde me once secretly as we walked aftir souper betwene your barne yarde & your highe gates/ that the Pope had dispensed with [i.e., *had permitted*] the Cardinall to haue a concubine/ which thing then (as litel learni*n*ge as I had) I coulde not beleue to be lawful.

Further on, he refers with scorn to another brother of the priory whom

Ashwell called into the argument to support the orthodox position:

> But then bringe you in for your helpe to co*n*fute my sainge your brother celerer [i.e., *cellarer*] called/ Joha*n* Berde/ or Johan Salpho/ a man of like learninge and coulde beter skill in makinge of a pease rike [i.e., *rick*] then in allegging of holy scripture.[12]

In this name of John Salpho we have doubtless an allusion to the family that maintained Salphobury Manor, one of the two manor houses located in Joye's home town of Renhold.

Concerning Joye's summons to London and his experiences after reaching there, we cannot do better than give the story in his own words.[13]. It is the only record we have, and illustrates his manner of writing in what might be called a lighter vein; for the account was not published till 1531, and then from the safe distance of Antwerp, so that Joye could afford to look back musingly on his escape. As one writer says of it, it is "an amusing and, considering the circumstances, good-tempered, account of his adventures at this time."[14] He writes:

> ¶The storie of my state/ aftir the Bishop had receaued the priours lettres.
>
> On the Saterdaye sevennyght before aduent sondaye/ the year of our Lorde M.D. XXVII. there were letters sent as frome the Cardinall by on of his officers to Cambridge/ delyuerde to the vice Canceller called Doctour Eadmonds master of Peter college/ where I was then felawe. In whiche letters he was commaunded to sende me up to appere at Westmynster the wedensdaye folowinge at.ix. of the clok with Bilney and Arture/ for certayne erroneus opinions &c. Our master sent for me on the morowe in to the co*n*trye/ and I came to him on the mondaye. He shewed me the lettres/ I red them/ and sawe the Cardinals signe manuall subscribed in great letters/ and his seale. I gote me horse when it snewed/ and was colde/ and came to Londen & so to Westmynster not longe aftir my hower/ when Bilney and Arture were in examinacion. Which thinge when I harde of/ and knew but those two poore shepe emonge so many cruell wolfis I was not ouer hastye to thruste in emo*n*ge them/ for there was a shrewd mayney [i.e., *company*] of bishops besidis the Cardinall with other of their faction. And I thought

> to heare howe these two litel lambes shulde spede yere [i.e., *ere*] I wolde put my selfe into those lyo*n*s mouthes.

Accordingly Joye went to dinner and then tarried walking about the city. Evidently he waited for a few days in hope of learning the outcome of Bilney's and Arthur's trial; but this went on for another week without a decision. So at length on Saturday, November 30, Joye decided to apply to an acquaintance of his, Sir William Gascoigne, who seems to have been a Bedfordshire man. His story resumes:

> At laste on the saterdaye I came to a Master of mine called Sir William Gascoingue/ the Cardinalis tresurer: and shewed him my errende/ but he knew al the co*n*vayaunce of my cause better the*n* I (for I beleue yet he was the author of al my trouble) a*n*d he bad me go in to the chamber of presens a*n*d there doctour capon shulde present me to the Cardinal. I was but a course courtyer neuer before heari*n*ge this terme cha*m*ber of presence ne knewe where it was and I was halfe a shamed to aske aftir it/ & went in to a longe entrye on the lefte hande/ and at laste happened vpon a dore & knocked/ and one opened it & when I loked in/ it was the kitche*n*/ then I we*n*t backe into the hall/ & asked for the chamber of presence & one poynted me up a payer of stayers. There stode I in the chamber of presence when I wolde with al my harte haue ben absens/ waytinge for doctour Capon almoste an hower/ for I was not ouer hasty to aske aftir him/ there no man knew me nor I them/ there was a grete fier in the chamber/ the wether was colde/ and I sawe now and than a Bishop come oute/ ...

But no one recognized him. After a while Gascoigne, the Cardinal's treasurer, sent for him:

> Then the tresurer sent for me downe into his cha*m*ber/ and there he tolde me/ that the Cardinal sente not for me. Then I beganne to smel their secrete conuayaunce/ & howe they had counterfeted their lordis the Cardinalis letters.

Joye here voices his suspicions; but there was probably no need to counterfeit the letters; they were doubtless issued at Longland's request. Gascoigne told Joye that it was Longland's suffragan bishop who had preferred the charges against him, and directed him to go to the Bishop of Lincoln's house. The story goes on:

> I went a good pase towerd the bishops place & overtoke his Chaunceler called doctour Rayns shewi*ng* hi*m* that I wolde speake wyth my lorde/ he shewed my lorde of me a*nd* said that I muste come agein the morninge at .vi. of the clocke. I did so/ & wayted for my lorde at the stayers fote till it was aboute .viij. My lorde came downe/ & I did my dutye to hym/ he asked me/ be you M. Joye? Ye forsothe my lorde *quoth* I. Abide said he with my Chaunceler til I come agene (for my lorde with al the bishopes toke their barges to waite vpon the Cardinall that morninge to Grenewiche to the kinge) I desierd my lorde to be good lorde unto me/ & to shew me his plesure/ what his lorshipe wold with me/ & wherfore I am th*us* sente unto hi*m*: & he answerd me like a lorde a*nd* bad me tarye with his chaunceler & said I shuld waite vpo*n* his laiser there toke I my leue of my lord & sawe hi*m* nomore.

Joye then heard that Gascoigne intended to ride into Bedfordshire the same day; so he went to see him again, only to have Gascoigne rebuke him for studying Origen and charge him with holding the same opinions as Bilney and Arthur:

> ... which discounforted me very sore/ whe*n* I perceyued hi*m* to be my enemie whom I toke for my good master: there I saw him laste.

Having taken his leave of Gascoigne, Joye returned to the bishop's house:

> Then came I to the bishops place agene at my howr & shewed my selfe to M. Chaunceler. And there daunsed I a colde attendance till almoste night/ a*nd* yet my lorde was not come/ then I we*nt* to M. Chaunceler with who*m* was watson the scribe/ desieri*ng* hi*m* that I mought departe for I thought my lorde wolde not come home that night/ saing that I had far to my lodginge/ & I loued not to walke late lothe they were I perceyued/ & especially the scribe that I shulde go: but thei wold nether bid me to souper nor promise me lodginge/ & I made haste sainge that I wolde come agene on the morowe to se & my lord were come home. The*n* said the scribe where

> is your lodginge? & here I was so bolde to make the Scribe a lye for his askinge/ telling hi*m* that I laye at the grene dragon towerd Bishops gate when I laye a myle of/ even a co*n*trary waye/ for I neuer trusted scribes nor pharisais/ & I perceyued he asked me not for eny good. Here I bad the*m* bothe good night. As I wente now I thought th*us* with my selfe/ I am a scoler of Cambridge vnd*er* only the vice chauncelers iurisdictio*n* & vnder the grete God the Cardinal/ & M. Gascoinge said the Cardi*nal* sent not for me/ I will take a brethe yere I come to these men agene.

After spending the night at the undisclosed inn, he decided the next day to make for the seaside and leave England behind him:

> On the morowe I was not ouer hastie to come to the Chaunceler/ but as I walked in the cite/ I met with a scoler of Cambridg & he tolde me that the bishop of Lincolne had sente his seruant besely [i.e., *busily*] to enquire & to seke me. what is the matter *qth* I? Mary *qth* he it is said that he wolde geue you a benefice for preachinge in his diocese. A benefice *qth* I? ye a Malefice rather/ for so rewarde they men for weldoinge. Then I gote me horse & rode fro my Benefice/ & lefte college and al that I had and convayed me selfe towerde the sea side ready to flee farther if nede were.

He chanced upon another acquaintance, who was surprised to see him in such strange parts:

> And in my traueli*n*ge I mette with a good felawe of my olde acquai*n*taunce which merueled gretly to see me in so strange a countrye to whome I opened my minde shewing him partely of my kareful state/ troublouse & painful iournes [*sic*] that I had both by vnknowne waies & also be night many times. Be my trowthe *qth* he I meruel ye be not robbed so many theveshe wayes as you haue riden. And then he warned me of a theveshe place that I muste nedes ride bye/ & I asked hi*m* agene know you the place & what grete men dwell theraboutis? ye wel said he/ then *qth* I. But dwel ther eny bishopes that waye? (for I had leuer haue mette with .xx. theues the*n* with one bishope) naye *qth* he then was I glad/ & rode on my waie/ & euer blessed me frome bishops.

Thus, early in December, Joye fled over the English Channel. Nothing more is known of the details of the journey. He tells us that

Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, "layed preuey wayte for me to be taken," and that West, Bishop of Ely, came to Cambridge after Joye had escaped, and had him expelled from his college of Peterhouse. Joye ends with a note of reproach for Prior Ashwell:

> ... your letters (as god knoweth) wroght me mich trouble/ & more the*n* I wil expresse at this time/ but miche more had they wroght me if I had taryed/ ... they made me sode*n*ly to fle/ to forsake my poore liuing [perhaps a reference to Humberston Abbey]/ my college/ my lerninge/ my promocio*n*/ & al that I had. They drove me forthe with grete pouertye & not with a litel heuines [i.e., *heaviness*] & perel by sea & lande oute of my natiue londe.

Once again, later in his life (1546), Joye looked back to this experience when he was reminding Stephen Gardiner of the change of heart that he thought had come over Gardiner since those Cambridge days. He writes:[15]

> And when I was sent for to the cardinall and accused by the byshop of lincolne langleyd [i.e., *Longland*] by sir william Gascoine knight y*e* cardinals treasurer and by the prior of Newnahams letters, whiche letters ye had, it was shewed me what good words & good counsell ye gaue me, and euen after it I did, and so escaped the cardinals and the byshops handes. For ye saide, I did wisely, if I coulde kepe me out of their hands, for that tyme did M. Bylney and arture apere before him, and I was sent for, to kepe them companye to haue holpen them to bere fagots or els to burne for gods word or to recant, But I thanke god and your premonicion and counsell for that I toke another waye.

It has been the attitude of certain older historians, who have spoken of Joye's flight from his native land, to excoriate him for his lack of heroism in not being willing to run the risk of imprisonment or burning by telling the truth.[16] They attack him for lying to Watson, the scribe, about where he would spend the night of December first, and then failing to appear before his bishop the next morning. But this is to assume that every man is potentially a hero and likewise that every bishop possesses absolute authority to command the priests in his diocese. Joye himself confesses to a distrust of bishops, a feeling he shared with many reformers of the period, and he seems well content to have escaped the ordeal of a trial and possible recantation, such as befell his comrades Bilney and Arthur. As between the ignominy of fleeing or of abjuring, the choice was not simple. To demand that Joye should have stood his ground in December, 1527 at the risk of martyrdom is to require of him what no other reformer (aside from the Lollards) had felt called upon to endure at that early date. Even the prospect of exile, though less abhorrent than burning, was both dangerous and doubtful. In any case, it was Joye's choice to make, and exile seemed to him the lesser evil.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

[1] The name is derived from the Low German *Staalhof*, meaning a sample-yard, but later confused with the word *Stahl* or steel. Sometimes called also the Still-yard, it was located along the Thames near the site of the present Cannon Street station, and flourished there for three hundred years, beginning about 1250.

[2] The letter was published in an English translation in 1536 (*S.T.C.* 4021). The earlier Latin edition was entitled *Joannes Bugenhagen Epistola ad Anglos* (1525); and the German version, *Ein Sendbrieff an die Christen ynn Engeland, warynnen ein Christlich Leben stehet.* See Panzer, *Annales*, IX, 86, and Weller, *Repertorium typographicum*, p. 371.

[3] The letter is in Low German (*S.T.C.* 16778) and is here paraphrased because it is so little known. A copy is preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

[4] The first French version of the New Testament by Jacques Lefèvre was printed in 1523; Luther's German one, in 1522.

[5] *S.T.C.* 13086, fol. A5^v. An earlier Latin edition, with much shorter preface, was published December 2, 1526 (*S.T.C.* 13084). Both editions give the text of Luther's letter before printing Henry's reply.

[6] See *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, Vol. IV, Nos. 4693, 4694.

[7] See Arber, *The First Printed English New Testament*, pp. 46, 47.

[8] From Joye's *The letters which Iohan Ashwel ... sente secretely to the Bishope of Lyncolne* (*S.T.C.* 845), fol. A3.

[9] See the excerpt from Joye's *Refutation* cited below, p. 44.

[10] *The letters which Iohan Ashwel sente secretely ...*, fol. A2, 3.

[11] *Ibid.*, fol. A1^v.

[12] *Ibid.*, fol. B7.

[13] *Ibid.*, fol. C8^v; from the copy in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The British Museum copy is imperfect.

[14] Charles Sturge, *Cuthbert Tunstall*, p. 139.

[15] *The Refutation of the byshop of Winchester's derke declaration* (*S.T.C.* 14827), fol. M2.

[16] See, for example, S. R. Maitland, *Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England*, pp. 4-11; and J. Townley, *Illustrations of Biblical Literature*, II, 393.

4

His First Translations

WHILE we know that Joye fled across the Channel in December 1527, we do not know which city he chose for his first refuge. He would naturally have consulted his own safety above all else, and then perhaps would have considered the possibility of receiving some financial support or of being able to make his own way. The likeliest place might seem to be a town where Lutheran doctrines had already been received with favor, such as Wittenberg, Worms, Strassburg, or Marburg. But more convenient and nearer home were Antwerp and Calais, where there were established colonies of English merchants. For many years it was assumed that Joye went first to Strassburg, because the colophons of his earliest publications were dated from that city; but it has since been shown that these colophons were a ruse to throw his pursuers off the track, and that his first books were actually printed in and about Antwerp. The earliest of them, however, so far as we can judge, could not have been published before the latter part of 1529; so the question arises, Where was Joye from the beginning of 1528 to the middle of 1529?

His own words are too general to give us any aid; he merely says:

> I wolde right gladly returne & dare not/being exiled into a strange lande emo*n*ge rude & boisterou*s* people/ with whose maners I cannot wel agre/ which is to me no litel crosse/ ...[1]

The likelihood is that he went directly to Calais and then, as soon as he could, either to Antwerp or to Strassburg. The stronger presumption is much in favor of Antwerp; yet the fact that he published books there from 1529 to 1535 does not preclude a possibility that he may have made his way first to Strassburg or some other friendly city. His earliest publications show a certain attachment to the works of Martin Bucer, chief of the Strassburg reformers; and indeed his use of Strassburg as an alibi in the colophons of the books he put forth at Antwerp in 1530 and 1531 would perhaps gain added point if he had actually resided in Strassburg at least for a short while.

In such a case, he would have found there two Englishmen who were both interested in promulgating the Scriptures in the English tongue, namely William Roye and Jerome Barlow. On August 31, 1527, Roye had finished the preface to his "Lytle treatous or dialoge" between a "Christen Father and his stobborne Sonne," which was published the same year at Strassburg; while early in the next year either Roye or Barlow (more likely the latter) issued the so-called "Burying of the Mass" from the same city. This latter work contained a scurrilous attack on Cardinal Wolsey in doggerel rhyme; its title page began with the words, "Rede me and be nott wrothe."[2] In it two priests' servants, Watkyn and Jeffrey, discuss the decline and discontinuance of the celebration of the Mass, and the author (Barlow?) credits Strassburg with being the place where the Mass first deceased:

J. … But now to our mater agayne/
I wolde heare marvelously fayne/
In what place the masse deceased.

W. In Strasbrugh/ that noble towne/
A Cyte of most famous renowne/
Wheare the gospell is frely preached.

J. And what dost thou their names call/
Which were counted in especiall/
The aduersaries of the masse?

W. Truly there where clarkes many one/
And gretly learned every chone [i.e., *each one*]/
Whose names my memory do passe.

Howe be it/ Hedius/ Butzer/ and Capito/
Celarius/ Symphorian/ and wother mo [i.e., *other more*]/
In dede were reputed the chefe.

In the summer of 1527 Tyndale was at Worms, but sometime before May of 1528 he had removed to Antwerp; for he published there his *Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, in the preface to which he disclaims and repudiates the "railing rhymes" that Barlow and Roye had recently issued from Strassburg.

And well he might; for in the spring of 1528 the English clergy redoubled their vigorous prosecution of heretics at home. Sir Thomas More was granted special permission to read heretical books for the purpose of "detecting" them. Already by the end of February, Cardinal Beaton had ordered, at St Andrews, the burning of Scotland's first Protestant martyr—Patrick Hamilton, a young nobleman who had imbibed Luther's teachings during a stay at Marburg. For the next eleven months, arrests and examinations were taking place in London and in the eastern counties of England, while agents sent abroad reported back to Wolsey whatever intelligence they could gather concerning the reformers who had fled overseas. Early in 1529 the King issued the first of his proclamations against the circulation of Lutheran books.[3]

The outbreak of persecution at home constrained several of Joye's Cambridge acquaintances to follow him across the Channel. Robert Barnes, feigning to have drowned himself, escaped from Northampton and fled to Antwerp and later went to Wittenberg. Coverdale also fled, apparently to Hamburg. George Constantine seems to have gone to Antwerp for a time. Young John Frith, having escaped from an embroilment with the authorities at Oxford, whither he had been transferred, seems also to have made his way to Antwerp. Thither also came Simon Smith and Simon Fish, each implicated in helping to spread the English New Testament; and in due course Roye and Barlow came to Antwerp too, having perhaps worn out their welcome at Strassburg. We may certainly conclude, therefore, that even if Joye had not settled at Antwerp in the first place, he would have found his way there before the year 1529.

It is certain that Tyndale and Joye first met shortly after Joye arrived on the Continent. Joye was conceited, Tyndale was uncompromising, and the two men irritated each other from the beginning. In his *Apology*, written in 1535, Joye indicates that they had had sharp disagreements from the time he first "came over." After the manner of quarrelsome men he fastens the blame for their quarrels on Tyndale. Whenever they reasoned together on a knotty theological question, says Joye, "thorow his impacience our disputacion euer ended with chyding and brawling."

There were good reasons for the exiles to feel that Antwerp afforded them special advantages. First, it was the seat of a considerable colony of English merchants, among whom the reformers could mingle in comparative safety and some of whom might by sympathetic enough to shield them from the prying eyes of inquisitors. Second, it was not too distant from the eastern counties of England; and the zeal of the reformers was steadily directed toward disseminating the "new learning" among their brethren at home. Third, the city was well equipped with printers and publishers, some of whom were willing to take risks, if need be, to supply the growing market of English readers with heretical books in their own tongue. Moreover, the abundance of publishers in and around Antwerp would afford some opportunity of employment to the refugees as editors or proofreaders for the English trade.

The cause of evangelical Protestantism owes a great debt to these Antwerp printers. Whether their motives were mercenary or evangelical, or a mixture of both, they put themselves in jeopardy often, and sometimes suffered severe penalties, by reason of their traffic in forbidden books. It is no wonder that in times of stress they printed their output without giving any clue to their own identity or else under fictitious colophons. Three printers, particularly, stood ready to publish books by the English reformers: Christopher Van Endhoven, Johannes Hoochstraten, and Marten de Keyser. The first brought out two or more unauthorized editions of Tyndale's New Testament; the second issued quite a stream of "heretical" books, making it appear that they were printed by "Hans Luft" of Marburg, or "Malborow" as it was sometimes spelled.[4] (The real Hans Lufft meanwhile was operating at Wittenberg.) The third, Marten de Keyser, published books by Tyndale and Joye in 1530 and 1531; and of him we shall hear again. Of lesser importance were two other Antwerp printers, Johannes Grapheus and Simon Cock. Still others were Adrien Van Berghen, Nicholas de Grave, and Godfried Van der Haeghen.[5]

THE LOST PRIMER

The first of Joye's publications—a Primer in English—was doubtless put forth by one of the printers named above, but the book itself has not survived. Our knowledge of it has to be pieced together from allusions to it in other writings of the period. This was the first English Primer to be printed.[6] It is practically certain that it was not published by De Keyser, but perhaps by Simon Cock or Christopher Van Endhoven. We do not even know the exact form of its title, though we have reason to suppose that it read something like this: "The English Primer: Matins and Evensong, the VII Psalms and other heavenly Psalms, with the Commendations." Sir Thomas Hitton, who was martyred in February, 1530, confessed that he had brought home with him a copy of the English Primer from "beyond the seas."

Positive knowledge of such a book is to be found in the "Publick Instrument" which was drawn up by a royal commission of bishops and churchmen who met in May 1530 to consider certain heretical books.[7] Their report mentions a Primer in English, and alleges against it four specific faults: that it contained the Seven Psalms but not the Litany; that it left out the hymns and anthems to Our Lady; and that in the calendar preceding the Primer, Enoch was said to have died like other men instead of being "translated," and the meritorious intentions of David and Nathan in building the temple were said to have counted for naught.

Sir Thomas More, then Lord Chancellor, was undoubtedly the one who drew up these objections to the English Primer, and it was he also who, in 1532, ascribed the authorship of the Primer by hearsay to George Joye:[8]

> For the Prymer and Psalter, prayours & all/ were tra*n*slated and made in this maner, by none other but heretykes.
>
> The Psalter was translated by George Iay the preste, y*t* [i.e., *that*] is wedded now/ and I here say the Prymer to, wherein the seuen psalmes be set in wythout the lateny, leste folke shold pray to sayntes. And y*e* Dirige is lefte out clene/ lest a man myght happe to pray theron for hys fathers soule.

We cannot tell, of course, just what this earliest Primer comprised, but we can surmise that it contained an almanac of Easter dates, a calendar of saints' days and holy days interspersed with theological commentary, and the Matins, Hours, Evensong, and Compline, as well as the Seven Penitential Psalms and the Commendations—the last being the name given to Psalm 119. What the "other heavenly Psalms" mentioned on the title page may have been, can also be surmised: they might include the Psalms of the Passion (22-31) or perhaps certain canticles or prayers, such as those of Hannah, Daniel, Jonah, and Isaiah. There would also be included several hymns and perhaps a few "lessons" from the Scriptures; but these would have followed the Lutheran tradition rather than that of the older and orthodox Book of Hours. For one of More's objections was that the Primer omitted the prayers addressed to the Virgin.

Judging from Joye's later publications, this first edition of the Primer would perhaps have contained the text, translated into English, of more than thirty Psalms. But in what version were they? It is a pity the book has been lost, for these were the first Psalms to be printed in English.

In September, 1529, a new Latin version of the Psalter had been published in Strassburg, accompanied by a commentary. Both were by Martin Bucer, who made use of the pseudonym, Aretius Felinus.[9] This work was the basis of the translation of the whole Psalter which Joye published in January, 1530, and it is possible that, directly upon the appearance of Bucer's work, Joye set out to translate such of the Psalms as he would need for his Primer. He was a hasty workman, and it is quite thinkable that he could have had his Primer ready for the printer before the year 1529 was wholly out. This would have been in ample time for Thomas Hitton to have procured a copy in the neighborhood of Antwerp before being apprehended as a heretic upon his return to England early in 1530.[10]

Another book that was serviceable to Joye was the *Precationes Biblicae* (Prayers of the Bible) collected by Otto Brunfels and published at Strassburg in September 1528. It was a compilation of Latin prayers taken from the Vulgate Bible, with a short foreword on the efficacy of prayer to avert God's wrath and to deliver from the perils of these "latter days." The first prayer selected by Brunfels was accordingly the prayer of Moses as given in Exodus (32 : 11-13), dissuading the Lord from visiting his wrath upon the children of Israel. In the second edition of the Primer Joye took over this foreword and opening prayer from Brunfels' book and combined them so as to form a brief admonition which he called "Prayer peaseth God's wrath." There is reason to believe that this item was also included in the first edition of his Primer;[11] for Joye's translation of the prayer from Exodus is based on Brunfels' Vulgate text and not upon the rendering of the same passage which Tyndale published in his Pentateuch of January 1530. After citing the prayer of Moses, Joye goes on to say:

> Considering therefore prayer to be of such efficacy and virtue, and that Christ himself commanded us to pray also in these perilous days: me thinketh it necessary that the lay people should have the prayers most convenient for this time, which prayers are the Psalms, and that in English, that their faith might the more increase.

This remark on the need for the Psalms to be made available in English sounds very much as though Joye were advertising to his reader that samples of the Psalms were to be found scattered through the Primer. Thereby he was also preparing the way for a favorable reception of his new translation of the whole Psalter on which he was then at work.

THE PSALTER OF 1530

Meanwhile affairs in England had not stood still. Henry had determined to marry Anne Boleyn, and he applied to the Pope by every means he could think of for a special dispensation that would annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Cardinal Wolsey conducted the negotiations at the King's behest, applying such pressures as he could through the devious channels of diplomacy. But the Pope temporized, and during the summer of 1529 a long trial ensued before the papal legate, ending in adjournment before the issue had been settled. Upon the collapse of Wolsey's schemes to obtain the desired annulment, the King stripped the Cardinal of all his posts of power save the archbishopric of York. On October 25 Sir Thomas More took over the post of Lord Chancellor. The news of so important an event as Wolsey's dramatic fall must quickly have reached the English refugees at Antwerp.

During the early part of 1529 William Tyndale had laid plans to publish his translation of the first five books of Moses, and for this purpose he left Antwerp and went to Hamburg. But on his way there (according to Foxe) he met with shipwreck and lost his manuscript. Therefore he spent the remainder of the year at Hamburg doing the work over again, but in December he decided to return to Antwerp and publish his translation there. The work was entrusted to Hoochstraten, who on January 17, 1530, brought out Tyndale's Pentateuch, with a false ascription to the press of "Hans Luft."

Conceivably, it could have been Tyndale's absence from Antwerp which turned Joye's thoughts more positively to the project of translating the Scriptures into English, particularly those portions on which he knew that Tyndale had not been employed; and of these (as he says) "the prayers most convenient for this time" were the Psalms. At any rate, it was on January 16, 1530, the very day before Tyndale's Pentateuch appeared, that another Antwerp printer, Marten de Keyser, brought out Joye's first translation of the entire Book of Psalms. This is the earliest extant work we have by Joye, and in some respects it is also the most important.

It was a small volume printed in a modified black-letter type,[12] and bearing the title:

> ¶The Psalter of Dauid in Englishe purely a*n*d faithfully tra*n*slated aftir the texte of Feline: euery Psalme hauynge his argument before/ declarynge brefly thentente & substance of the wholl Psalme.

"Feline" of course was Martin Bucer (Aretius Felinus), and the "argument" or summary which preceded each Psalm was taken over from Bucer's edition, though often in altered form. The colophon of the book read:

> ¶ Emprinted at Argentine in the yeare of oure lorde 1530. the .16. daye of Ianuary by me Francis foxe. ¶Praise ye the lorde.

"Argentine" was the contemporary name for the printers' quarter at Strassburg; but (as was said) the ascription is false, the printing having been done by De Keyser in Antwerp.[13]

On the reverse of the title page Joye addresses the reader under a palpable nom-de-plume:

> ¶ Iohan Aleph greteth the Englishe nacion.
>
> Be glad in *ye* lorde (dere brothern) & geve him thankes: which nowe at *ye* laste/ of his merciable goodnes hath sente ye his Psalter in Englishe/ faithfully & purely translated: which ye may not mesure and Iuge [i.e., *judge*] aftir the come*n* texte. For the trowth of *ye* Psalmes muste be fetched more nyghe *ye* Ebrue verite/ in the which tonge Dauid/ with the other

> syngers of y*e* Psalmes firste sunge them. Let y*e* gostly lerned in y*e* holy tonge be iuges. It is y*e* spirituall man (saith Paule) which hath the spirit of god y*t* muste decerne & iuge all thynges. And y*e* men quietly sittynge (if the truth be shewed the*m*) muste iuge and stand vp and speke (the firste interpret*er* holdynge his pease) god geve ye true spirituall & quiete sittynge iuges. Ame*n*.

A couple of points in this are worth comment: The reference to the "Hebrew verity" echoes a sentiment much in the reformers' mouths, that the commonly accepted Latin text is not so reliable as the Hebrew original, on which (in this instance) Bucer based his Latin version. The reference to St Paul is to two passages in I Corinthians: in one (2 : 15) Paul writes, "But he that is spiritual judgeth all things"; and in the other (14 : 29, 30), "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."

Following Psalm 150 there appears, printed in solid capitals, the motto: "Loave ye the Lorde. Amen." Here the word "loave" is an old form meaning to praise. Joye used it occasionally, but his later editors nearly always reprinted it as "love." Lastly, before the colophon comes an alphabetical "table to fynde the Psalmes" which gives the Latin title of each with its page number.

There is much corroborative evidence to show that Joye was the author of this translation, but the matter is placed beyond reasonable doubt by the "argument" preceding Psalm 89, which reads as follows:

> The argument into the .89. psal.
>
> In this psal. is declared goodly and at large the newe and olde Testament or couenaunte which is smitten by Christe y*e* sone of David betwene god and his chosen never to bebroken and that vnder the fygure of David & of his posterite.
>
> For a declaracion of y*e* firste parte of this psalme. and knowelege of theis two wordis Mercy & Faithfulnes/ ye shall vnderstande y*t* [i.e., *that*] God of his Mercy and goodnes first promiseth: and for his truthes sake he perfourmeth it/ which Faithfull p*er*formynge/ the prophet calleth Faithfulnes.

> Wherfore theis two wordes/ Mercy and Faithfulnes/ are comenly ioyned togith*er* in y*e* psalmes.

Joye himself refers to this "argument" in his reply to Prior Ashwell's letters; for we read in the edition of 1531 (fol. B3):

> Vvherfore the scripture comenly ioyneth these two wordes/ mercie & Truthe of faithfulnes togither especially in the Psalms as I noted in the argument of the .89. Psalme/ …

Other evidences of Joye's authorship are in the similarity between the translations of 1530 and 1534 (to be discussed later) and in the peculiarities of diction that are to be found in this earlier Psalter. There is also, of course, Sir Thomas More's attribution of the Psalter to "George Iay the preste," as cited above from a work which More published in 1532.

Perhaps the reader should have presented to him at this point the text of the opening Psalm as Joye rendered it in this edition of 1530:

> The argume*nt* of this firste psal.
>
> Thei that forsake the counsels/ the wayes/ the lernyng/ and conuersacion of the vngodly: geuinge the*m* selue wholl to y*e* knowledge of goddis lawe/ and to live ther after/ are blessed: thoth*er* [i.e., *the other*] are wiked & vngodly. The blessed ar likened to a moiste/ frutful tre faste planted by the waterside: y*e* vngodly/ to drie bare*n* dust scatred with the winde.
>
> Blessed is y*t* man which walketh not in the counsell of the vngodly: and standeth not in the waye of si*n*ners/ and sitteth not in the seate of y*e* pestelent scorners.
>
> But hath all his plesure in y*e* lawe of the lorde: and vpon it his minde is occupyed/ bothe daye & nyghte.
>
> Syche a man shalbe like a tre planted by the ryuerside: which will gyue forth hyr frutis in due time/ and hyr leves shall not with*er*: for what so ever he shall do/ shall prospere.
>
> But so shall not the vngodly: for they shalbe lyke duste which is dispersed with the winde.

> Wherfore theis vngodly shall not stande in the iugement: nether theis sinners maye abyde in the company of the rightwise.
>
> For the lorde aproueth [i.e., *approveth*] the waye of the rightwise: but ye waye of sinners shall perishe.

Plainly, this is not translation of a high literary excellence, it is crude pioneering rather; yet it is not without interest. Joye's choice of the word "ungodly" was to become a fixture in this first Psalm. In the opening verse, the memory of the traditional rendering based on the Vulgate, "sat not in the chair of pestilence," perhaps explains Joye's insertion of the word "pestilent" before the "scorners." But in verse 5, his wording is greatly in advance of the old Wycliffite rendering, "Therfor wickid men risen not agen in doom."

This Psalter is sprinkled with many quaint and colloquial turns of speech, occasionally smacking of Joye's provincialism. In Psalm 22: 15 we have: "my tonge cleved to the sydes of my mouth/ thou hast dreste me to my grave." And Psalm 32 : 4 reads: "my moister [i.e., *moisture*] was dryed vp like as on [i.e., *one*] tosted in *ye* middis of somer." Two especially odd verbs, "mugger up" and "quitch," hardly to be found in any dictionary,[14] occur in Psalms 62 : 10 and 76 : 8:

> Truste not in riches goten with wronge and forse: lest ye mugger vp vnto yowe [i.e., *you*] vanite/ ...
>
> Even from heven thou causest thi fearfull iugement to be harde [i.e., *heard*]: therthe [i.e., *the earth*] feared & dirst not ons [i.e., *once*] quitche.

Another strange term, "retch," apparently meaning to guide, is cited only from the text where it occurs in this Psalter (23 : 2): "& dyd dryve and retche me at layser [i.e., *leisure*] by the swete ryvers."

When Coverdale came to make his own translation of the Psalms for the Bible of 1535 he wisely avoided most of Joye's unusual terms. There is no question, however, but that he was acquainted with Joye's attempt. Indeed, it is through Coverdale that the Joye Psalters are entitled to their slender claim as having part in the making of the Authorized Version. That Coverdale really took cognizance of these

Psalters (though not of Joye himself by name) is evident from such examples as "shepehoke" [sheep-hook] in Psalm 23 and "bugges" in Psalm 91.[15] The latter of these is, of course, the more famous and gave rise to a whole series of so-called "Bug" Bibles. The reading of verse 5 in this 1530 edition is:

> Thou shalt not nede to be a frayede of nyght bugges: nether of the Arowes that flee be daye.

This the Coverdale Bible renders as follows:

> So y*t* thou shalt not nede to be afrayed for eny bugges by night, ner for arowe that flyeth by daye.

Other peculiarities of Joye's style also appear in this 1530 Psalter: for example, his use of Latinistic terms, especially of adjectives which he employs as nouns. Another of his favorite words was "opprobry," as in Psalm 42 : 12 : "they cast in to my teche [misprint for *teeth*] this grevous opprobry saynge dayly/ where is thy god?" It occurs again in company with "abject" used as a noun (Ps. 22 : 6):

> But as for me/ I am but a worme a*n*d no man: even the opprobry of the men/ and an abiecte from the vyleste folke.

In Joye's later version of the Psalms (1534), this last clause becomes "a vyle abiecte in ignominye of the comen peple."

Once in a while Joye's mastery of the Latin tongue proves unequal to the haste that urges him on. Psalm 147 : 10, for instance, has an amusing error:

> He delighteth not in stoughte and strong stedes: nether hath he plesure in the trompetes of men.

Here Joye mistakes *tibia* for *tuba*. Coverdale corrects the reading thus:

> He hath no pleasure in the strength of an horse, nether delyteth he in eny ma*n*s legges.

It was inevitable that this first Psalter of Joye's should be quickly superseded by the smoother workmanship of Coverdale. Joye seems to have tossed it off hastily as a sort of stopgap, that his countrymen might have at least *some* version of the Psalms to read in their own tongue. The readers of his day received it gratefully enough, but the ecclesiastical authorities promptly denounced it as heretical.

It remains to add that a second edition of this 1530 version was issued in London just as soon as it became safe for publishers there to print the Scriptures in the English tongue. This second edition was printed by Thomas Godfray and duly reproduces the wording of Joye's title and text, including the "argument" before each Psalm. "Johan Aleph's" address to the English nation is also reprinted on the reverse of the title page, but now is headed simply "To the reder" with no mention of either Joye or Aleph.[16] The printing of the whole volume is poor and crowded. Only one known copy survives, in the library of the University of Cambridge. It has a colophon which reads:

> Printed at London by Thomas Godfray. Cum priuilegio Regali.
> Praise ye the lorde. Amen.

The book is undated but can be conservatively assigned to the latter half of 1534. A third edition, with collects added, was published by Edward Whitchurch, probably in 1541.

HORTULUS ANIMAE

On February 20, 1530, a priest named "Sir" Thomas Hitton was burned at Maidstone as a heretic and thus became the first Englishman among the Reformation martyrs. He had been on the Continent shortly before and was probably known personally to the English refugees in Antwerp. In January or early February he was apprehended in Kent for preaching heretical opinions. At his examination he confessed that he had smuggled a New Testament and a Primer in from the Continent; the date of the affair makes it possible that he might also have brought in Joye's Psalter, which had appeared in January.

According to Tyndale, Hitton was "dieted" and tortured before he was condemned and burnt.[17] His death made a deep impression on both Tyndale and Joye, and there is a curious allusion to him, as we shall see, in Joye's next publication.

The new Parliament, which Henry convened after the fall of Wolsey, met on November 3, 1529, and sat until the middle of December. During the whole year following it was prorogued, partly on account of the virulence of the plague in London that summer. Hence it enacted no further statutes during 1530, and did not sit again until the next January. But in the meantime the presses in the neighborhood of Antwerp were releasing English New Testaments and other forbidden literature, and the concern of the clergy over heretical books was mounting again, especially in the eastern counties. Early in May 1530, Bishop Tunstall (who had recently been translated from London to the see of Durham) presided at another burning of New Testaments at Paul's Cross. On May 14, Bishop Nix of Norwich addressed a plaintive letter to Archbishop Warham urging that Henry be asked to repudiate rumors then circulating to the effect that the King had sanctioned the reading of vernacular Testaments by the people.

But the King had already summoned a commission of prelates and of representatives from the two universities to determine what heresies were to be found in Tyndale's New Testament and certain other books. The commission sat for a couple of weeks debating the matter and listening to allegations drawn up by the Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, and at length, on May 24, drew up the "Publick Instrument" referred to above.[18] Finally, in June the King issued another formal proclamation forbidding the possession or circulation of such books.

The reformers at Antwerp were not deterred by this renewed activity. It was presumably during that summer—perhaps in late June or July (the month is uncertain)—that Marten de Keyser printed for Joye a revised edition of his English Primer, this time under the title of *Hortulus Animae*, or Garden of the Soul. The new volume was of the same general form and style as the Psalter printed in January,[19] and had a similar colophon reading as follows:

> ¶ Emprinted at Argentine in the yeare of ower lorde. 1530. by me Francis Foxe Praise ye the lorde.

The title page shows the title standing at the head of a sort of table of contents:

> ¶ Ortulus anime. The garden of the soule: or the englisshe primers (the which a certaine print*er* lately corrupted/ & made false to the grete sclaunder of thauthor & greter desayte [i.e., *deceit*] of as many as boughte and red the*m*) newe corrected and augmented.

Firste there is a newe kalendarie

The passion of owre saviowre Christe: orderly with the co*n*cordance of the fower euangelistes

A fruteful instructio*n* for childre*n*

A Christe*n* dialoge ful of lerning

A general confession before god

Ther is a psalm. added to the eue*n*song & Iudica me to the complene with Salue re . and a colete [i.e., *collect*] therto.

The seuen psalmes.

The psalm. of the passion.

The commendacions.

Al the psalmes newe corrected.

The prominence given to the "newe kalendarie" in the table of contents suggests very plainly that Joye had been informed that the royal commission which met in May had found fault with the calendar in the first edition of the Primer. It might have been one of his Cambridge acquaintances who communicated to him the findings of that commission—perhaps Hugh Latimer or John Thixtel, both of whom were in attendance at its sessions. At any rate, the "heresies" complained of are not to be found in the revised calendar of the *Hortulus*. It is indeed thinkable, in line with Joye's tendency towards self-justification, that he would try to shift the blame for such faults on to his printer; for he complains in the title that the text of the earlier edition had been corrupted "to the grete sclaunder of thauthor."

Be that as it may, the calendar of the new volume, and presumably of the earlier one also, was unusual in its composition. While listing the better known saints' days and holidays, it ignored many of the less familiar, utilizing the space thus saved to insert a running comment on various theological themes. This was in keeping with the reformers' practice of belittling the value of venerating saints or offering prayers to them. At one point—the "decollation" (or beheading) of John the Baptist, celebrated on August 29—Joye uses the occasion to launch into a long digression on the merits of giving heed to the preachers of God's Word, and the divine penalties threatening those who try to suppress such preaching. This congenial theme lasts him all through the rest of the calendar, with due interruptions now and again to record some special saint's day or holiday.

At another point in the calendar—February 23—he makes bold to introduce an allusion to Sir Thomas Hitton, whose martyrdom occurred about that time in the very year the *Hortulus* was published. This portion of the calendar is of sufficient interest to reproduce here. The first two columns show the so-called golden numbers and dominical letters used in calculating the dates for Easter:

ix	e	Sei*n*te Thomas [Hitton] mar.	23
	f	Matthye Apo. Acto. I.	24
xvii	g	Mathias before his e-	25
vi	A	leccio*n* was one of the.	26
	b	lxx. disciples whiche	27
xiiii	c	euer abode with their	28

master Christe from their first cal-
linge/ and slipte not from him nev*er*
to come ageine as some men dreame

The reference to St Matthias (Acts I 2: I-26) is rather obscure but seems to import that Joye did not agree with those who thought that the seventy disciples had all fallen away from loyalty to their Master.

As might well be imagined, Sir Thomas More was not slow to pick up the challenge implied in classifying Thomas Hitton as one of the saints. In the preface to his *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* (printed in 1532, fol. Bb2, Bb3) More writes:

> In theyr calendar before theyr deuout prayers, they haue sette vs a new saynt/ syr Thomas Hitton the heretyke that was burned in Kent, ... they haue as I sayde sette his name in the cale*n*dar byfore a boke of theyr englyshe prayours, by the name of saynt Thomas the martyr, in the vigyle of the blessed apostle saynte Mathye [i.e., *Matthias*], the xxiii. daye of February/ ...

More's description of the *Hortulus* as "a boke of theyr englyshe prayours," of "theyr deuout prayers," and earlier (fol. Bb1^{v}) as "a boke of other small deuocyons," may indicate that More himself had not seen a copy of the *Hortulus* or else that he did not have it by him. He seems not to have been acquainted with its correct name nor aware that it was simply a revised edition of Joye's Primer. Neither does he couple Joye's name with the "St Thomas" incident.[20] The new volume may never have had a very wide circulation, for it was proscribed as heretical before the end of 1531. The sole surviving copy today, which is in the British Museum, has a unique significance as the earliest extant Primer printed in English.

The second item listed among the contents on its title page is "The passion of owre saviowre Christe." This was a kind of harmony of the Gospels recounting the whole story of the Crucifixion. It was translated by Joye from a Latin text prepared by Martin Bucer,[21] but at times Joye added some coloring matter of his own. All in all, it is an intelligent piece of work and gives evidence of Joye's familiarity with the Tyndale New Testament of 1526.

The next two items listed, "A fruteful instructio*n* for childre*n*" and "A christe*n* dialoge ful of lerning," were both intended to implement the religious education of children. The former consisted mostly of prayers and graces, including the Lord's Prayer, and Joye afterward acknowledged that he himself had used certain of these prayers to instruct a young boy who had waited on him while he was once staying in London. The other, the Dialogue, is in the form of a catechism, "VVheryn the Childe asked certayne questions/ answerth to the same" (fol. H6). The teaching includes the Ten Commandments and seems to be based on Lutheran examples, such as Luther's *Enchiridion* of 1529.

Not listed in the contents on the title page, and hence probably carried over into the *Hortulus* from the first edition of the Primer, is a group of four prayers from the Bible.[22] Joye could have found these in the *Precationes Biblicae* of Otto Brunfels, mentioned above. The prayer from Isaiah we shall speak of again, for it became a topic of discussion between Joye and an unknown correspondent. In the *Hortulus* (fol. 18^v) it is furnished with a heading couched in Joye's typical vein:

> ¶ Here foloweth an effectuous prayer very nedefull for theis laste and perellous dayes to be saide withe teares and depe sighes frome the botome of ower harte, the prayer of the Prophete Esaye in the .lxiij. and .lxiiij. Chapiters of his prophesyes for the restoringe of Christes poore Chirche scaterde abrode withe persecution, forsaken and brente.

Another of the prayers, that of Jonah "deliured oute of the whales belye" (fol. K6^v), [23] was sufficiently popular in its own day for Joye's version to be reproduced in several other Primers during the coming decade. Special interest attaches to these four prayers because their publication in Joye's *Hortulus* (and presumably in his lost Primer) constituted the first printed English version of these particular portions of Scripture.

Also of special interest is the invitatory Psalm at the beginning of Matins (fol. L1), and this for two reasons: first, the responses which accompany it are no longer in the traditional words, "Hail Mary, full of grace; the Lord is with thee," but are drawn instead from the Gospel of Matthew (11 : 28), "Come vnto me all ye that labour a*n*d are laden: and I shall refreshe yowe"; second, the rendering of this Psalm (the ninety-fifth) is entirely different from the one Joye had published in his Psalter not many months before.[24]

This raises a difficult question. The title page of the *Hortulus* says that all the Psalms are "newe corrected." But actually, of the thirty-nine included in the *Hortulus* all but a few are identical with those in the Psalter of 1530. There is, unfortunately, no way of telling whether these may have been "corrected" as compared with the lost edition of the Primer. It is also true that, compared with the Psalter, the first three or four Psalms in the *Hortulus* show the greatest evidence of a revision. It would appear that Joye had started a complete revision for the *Hortulus* but had soon given it over. Another curious fact is that what the title page calls "The psalm. of the passion" does not appear in the volume at all. It seems to have been Joye's intention to print a section comprising the Psalms of the Passion—or at least the first of such a group, which would have been Psalm 22—but no such thing appears. Instead, the volume concludes with the Psalm 119, in those days known as the "Commendations."

We must assume, in the absence of the lost Primer, that the central core of the *Hortulus*—that is, the Hours, from Matins to Compline—was carried over intact from the earlier book, except for such special additions as were noted on the title page, like Psalm 43 added to Compline and the *Salve Rex*. On the other hand, the Matins and Hours show a good deal of variation from the traditional usage of Sarum, not only at times in the choice of the Psalms, but also in the hymns and anthems and the "lessons" and "collects." The hymns are crudely contrived in verse, doubtless derived from originals in Latin. The first one, for instance, occurring right after the invitatory Psalm (fol. L2^{v}), reads as follows:

¶The hymne.

Praysed be god ower father/ for he hathe geue*n* vs his so*n*ne to be ower sauiowre.

We ar synners, vnrightwise, folyshe and fleshly.

> Christe is owre mercy stole [i.e., *stool*]: ower rightwisnes, and ower wisdome verely
>
> We are vnclene, holden vnder ye daunger of dethe and synne.
>
> Christe is ower holynes, ower lyfe ower satisfaccion, and redemption.
>
> Glory be to the, o Lorde, borne of the vyrgyn Marye, glory to the father, & to the holy goste. euer. AMEN.

Of the three "lessons" included in Matins, two were passages from the New Testament and the third was from the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon.[25] In the *Hortulus* these took the place of those "lessons" usually devoted to adoration of the Virgin.

Like the earlier edition of the Primer, of which More had complained, the *Hortulus* contained neither Litany nor Dirge. At the very end of the volume, just above the colophon, Joye printed the opening words of Isaiah 59, apparently as a sort of *envoi*. They read:

> Lo, the lorde is yet alyue, whose power is not so minisshed but he maie vs yet saue, nether are his eares so stopped but he will vs yet heare.

How widely the *Hortulus* circulated we do not know; but at least it formed the basis of several other English Primers issued during the next few years.[26] After 1539 it was displaced, however, by newer editions.

PROPHET ISAIAH

It was not till the spring of 1531 that Joye brought out his next production in the field of Bible translation. Meanwhile, in England, the inexorable trend toward the establishment of a self-sufficient national Church moved forward. In the King's "great matter" of securing a divorce from Catherine so that he could marry Anne Boleyn, it had been suggested by Thomas Cranmer that the opinions of the universities should be polled. After Cambridge and Oxford had upheld the position taken by the King, other European universities were invited to submit their views. The results, though ostensibly favorable to the King, were inconclusive. In November, 1530, Wolsey died while on his way to stand trial on charges of treason. Henry seized the occasion of his death to levy a fine against the clergy collectively for having given countenance to the fallen traitor. Then in February the King prevailed upon Convocation to acknowledge him tentatively as supreme head of the English Church.

The reformers and those favoring circulation of the Scriptures in English were heartened by the bold stand taken by Hugh Latimer in a letter which (it was rumored) he had addressed to the King in December.[27] Also at this time, apparently, copies of an unauthorized edition of Tyndale's New Testament, printed at Antwerp by Christopher Van Endhoven were again surreptitiously finding their way to English readers. Tyndale himself, in his latest book, *The Practice of Prelates*, written before he had learned of Wolsey's death, not only excoriated the ambitious career of the Cardinal but also gave attention to the matter of the royal divorce. In the early months of 1531 the King's minister, Thomas Cromwell, who had assumed the practical management of affairs of state now that Wolsey was gone, sent one of his agents into the Low Countries to try to reach some understanding with Tyndale about returning to England. But Tyndale was not persuaded. He was understandably wary of putting himself into the King's power, and so no reconciliation was effected; indeed it is hard to see how any could have been. The agent, Stephen Vaughan, sent back a series of reports to Cromwell and the King. In one of these (dated April 17) he speaks of having talked with Tyndale outside the city of Antwerp. In another letter, dated June 19, Vaughan alludes to two new books that had recently appeared:

> The Prophetts Esay and Jonas are put forthe in thenglishe tonge, and passethe any mannes poore [i.e., *power*] to stopp them from comyng forthe.[28].

These two books, each presenting a printed version of the prophet for the first time in English, were products of the press of Marten de Keyser. Tyndale's translation of Jonah, "with an introduccio*n* before techinge to vnderstonde him and the right vse also of all the scripture/" is preserved in a unique copy in the British Museum. It was issued probably between May 15 and June 1: a thin volume of 24 leaves, more than three-quarters of which was taken up with the prologue or introduction.

The other book was Joye's translation of the Prophet Isaiah, printed on May 10 according to its colophon. The friendly overtures made to Tyndale by Cromwell's emissary, Vaughan, seem to have encouraged both translators to acknowledge their own output: for Tyndale heads his introduction to Jonah, "W. T. vn to the Christen reader"; while Joye puts his full name to the title page of his Isaiah: "The Prophete Isaye/ translated into englysshe/ by George Ioye."

The printer, however, used all due precaution. This same year, another Antwerp printer, Christopher Van Endhoven, was cast into prison in London for circulating English Testaments, and died in consequence. De Keyser, accordingly, put his name to neither volume: *The prophete Ionas* was printed without any colophon at all; and Joye's Isaiah was furnished with yet another fictitious one:

> Printed in Straszburg by Balthassar Beckenth in the year of our lorde 1531 . the . x . day of Maye.

The book was a well-printed volume in black letter, comprising 112 leaves. Three copies are known to survive: one at Cambridge University Library, another at Baptist College, Bristol, and an imperfect copy at the Bodleian Library.

Joye prefaces his translation with a prologue several pages long, in the course of which he reverts to his well-worn theme of impending doom that can only be averted through familiarity with the Scriptures (fol. A5^{v}):

> And nowe at the laste (the worlde corrupte with the same Idolatrye a*n*d lyke abhominacio*n* as it was in Isayes tyme & at Christes comynge/ whom therfore ther muste nedes abyde lyke destruccion & captiuite/ if we be not captyue al redye) God of his infinite goodnes hathe restored vs his prophete

> Isaye speakinge playne englysshe which haue ben locked vp longe in latyne so y*t* the laye ma*n* (I dare saye) vnderstode hym not/ nor yet parauenture many that repute the*m* selfe learned.

The Latin text from which Joye chose to make his translation into "playne englysshe" was not the accepted Vulgate. He shared the reformers' estimate, derived from Erasmus and other scholars, of the importance of recourse to the original tongues; but since he himself had no adequate knowledge of Hebrew, he was compelled to rely on the version of some competent scholar who claimed to translate directly from the original. As he had relied on the work of Bucer for the Psalter, so now for the Book of Isaiah he turned to a Latin version published in 1529 by the Swiss reformer, Huldreich Zwingli.[29] Joye seems to have found Zwingli's point of view congenial, for he makes use of the latter's works in several of his subsequent publications.

Zwingli's version of Isaiah was printed in parallel columns with Jerome's Vulgate and was supplemented by a detailed explanation of the relationship (as Zwingli saw it) between his own version and the Hebrew text. There is abundant evidence that Joye's version was based on Zwingli's Latin. For an example, in his *Hortulus Animae* of 1530 (and presumably in the lost edition of the preceding year) Joye had used Isaiah 57 : 20, 21 as part of an "anthem." He had heightened the phraseology, as he often delighted to do, with this result (fol. O6):

> The vngodly men are lyke a fearse swellinge see, whiche cannot reste but the waues of it rebounde withe violence castinge oute stynke and filthines, the deuelishe vngodly shal haue no reste (saith y*e* lorde) ...

Coverdale renders the passage with greater restraint in his Bible (1535):

> But the wicked are like the raginge see, that ca*n* not rest, whose water fometh with the myre & grauel. Eue*n* so y*e* wicked haue no peace, saieth my God.[30]

But in his *Prophet Isaiah* of 1531 Joye has a whole new rendering:

> But the vngodly are lyke the wode [i.e., *mad*] sea called Euripus which canne neuer reste hyr waters contynually troubled with slyme & stynkinge mudde/ a*n*d euen so haue the vngodly neuer rest nor peace saith my God.

And this is obviously derived from the Latin of Zwingli:

> Impij autem, Euripi instar, qui nescit quiescere, cum aquae eius limo & luto turbantur, sic non habet pacem, ait Deus meus.

There is also ample evidence that Joye did not altogether confine his attention to Zwingli's parallel version (or *Complanatio*), but likewise consulted the latter's extensive commentary (or *Apologia*). A conclusive instance of this is found in chapter 40 (verse 10). In the King James Bible the passage reads:

> Behold, the Lord God will come with strong *hand*, and his arme shall rule for him: behold, his reward *is* with him, and his worke before him.

Following the lead of Coverdale, the Great Bible rendered the last two clauses as follows: "Beholde, he bryngeth his treasure with hym, and his worckes go before hym." But here again, in his Isaiah, Joye expatiates at some length:

> Beholde/ he beinge cleare & noble both in counsell a*n*d in his actes/ shal bringe forth his ryches withe greate triumphe.

The explanation is to be found in Zwingli's text: for in his Latin version (p. 69) he said, "Lo, he will bring his riches with him, who is glorious in counsel and in exploits"; while in his commentary (p. 158) he remarks upon the Hebrew text (equivalent to *coram eo*, or "before him") that the prophet seems to use the expression with reference to a triumphal procession.[31]

As one might anticipate, Joye's version of Isaiah is not without many quaint touches of its own.[32] His homely turns of phrase are those of his own age rather than for all time. In Chapter 3, where the prophet is describing the shame that will be visited upon the daughters of Zion, he catalogues their various articles of finery (verses 18-23);

and Joye's terms for these fairly re-create for us the Tudor style of women's dress in the early part of the sixteenth century:

> ... and the lorde shal take from them the beuteful glory of their aparel their chaynes a*n*d stomachers/ their partelettes/ their armelets and burlettes their costelye broydred clothes both gowne and kyrtel/ pomaunders/ muske balles and earinges/ ringes and fro*n*telettes set with goolde & perle/ their cha*n*ges with their frockes/ their kerchews & pinnes their glasses & lawndes/ fillettes & hearbendes: ...

Coverdale too in his Bible gives a similar picture of the contemporary vogue but calls the articles by different names; yet near the conclusion of his list he impinges on Joye's wording in a couple of items, thus:

> ... rynges and garla*n*des, holy daye clothes and vales, kerchues and pynnes, glasses and smockes, bonettes and taches.

Is the duplication of "kerchews and pins" significant? Did Coverdale actually consult Joye's version of Isaiah when he made his own translation of the Bible in 1535? The over-all impression one receives from comparing the two versions is that Coverdale was undoubtedly aware of Joye's translation and did not ignore it; that he adopted many suggestions from it for a word, an expression, or a phrase here and there; but that he did not in any real sense use it as the basis for his own translation.

To cite a few instances out of many wherein Joye and Coverdale overlap in their versions of Isaiah:

(38 : 14)
GJI — Then chattred I lyke a swalowe/ and murmured lyke a Crayne/
Cov—Then chatred I lyke a swalowe, and like a Crane,

I moorned lyke a dove/ ...
and mourned as a doue.

(40 : 4, 6)
GJI— ... let euery vale be exalted/ a*n*d euery mountayne and
Cov— Let all valleis be exalted, and euery mountayne and

hyll be layed lowe/ ... the same voyce commaunded sayng: krye thou.
hill be layde lowe ... The same voyce spake: Now crie.

And I asked hi*m* what shal I krye? which answerde. That euery man is
And I sayde: what shal I crie? Then spake it: that, all flesh is

but grasse: a*nd* al their gloriouse beutye is lyke a flower of the
grasse, and that all the bewtie thereof, is as the floure of the

felde.[33]
felde.

(60 : 6)
GJI— ... aboundance of camels shall cover the/ Dromedares
Cov— The multitude of Camels shal couer y*e*, the Dromedaries

of Madian & Epha shal cloye y*e*/ al y*e* Sabens shal come bringinge
of Madia*n* and Epha. All they of Saba shal come bringinge

golde & incense geuinge prayse to the lorde.
golde & incense, & shewinge the prayse of the Lorde.

Coverdale's usual practice, however, is to strike out for himself in the choice of words and phrases; yet even in such passages there is apt to be some connecting link between his work and Joye's, as at the close of the following example (14 : 3-5):

> [Joye] And when y*e* lorde shal geve the reste frome thy laboures and tremblinge and frome thy greuouse seruitute by which thou were th*us* holden vnder: thou shalte take vp this lame*n*table songe agenste y*e* kinge of Babylo*n* sayng/ howe is this extorsener brought to reste with his golden taxes and trybutes? The lorde verely hath broke the staffe of the vngodly even the septre of these lordely rulers: ...

> [Coverdale] When y*e* Lorde now shal bringe y*e* to rest, fro*m* y*e* trauayle, feare, & harde bondage y*t* thou wast laden with all: then shalt thou vse this mockage vpon y*e* kinge of Babilon, & saye: How happeneth it y*t* y*e* oppressour leaueth of? Is y*e* golden tribute come to an ende? Doutles the Lorde hath broken the staff of the vngodly, & the cepter of y*e* lordly.

These two samples may stand as fairly typical of each translator. It appears then that while Coverdale never slavishly followed his predecessor, he did not ignore what Joye had done. No question is raised here as to which version is the better: Coverdale was master of a smooth-flowing, harmonious prose, compared with which Joye's outpourings seem hasty and unbalanced.

Mozley, in his valuable *Coverdale and His Bibles* (p. 53), suggests that Coverdale may have been in the employ of Marten de Keyser as a proofreader at the very time when Joye and Tyndale were seeing their books through De Keyser's press. He reminds us also that Coverdale made extensive use of the Swiss-German Bible compiled at Zurich (1529-1534) in which many of Zwingli's readings were incorporated. Had Joye been content to follow the traditional Latin of the Vulgate instead of having recourse to the labors of the reformers—Bucer, Zwingli, Melanchthon, and others—no doubt his translations would have stood more squarely in the line of development that led to the formation of the Authorized Version. At any rate, his contribution could then have been more easily estimated. But he eagerly rushed into print, and his untempered reforming zeal urged him at every point to depart from the accepted path.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

[1] *The letters which Iohan Ashwel sente secretely* ..., fol. D3.

[2] *S.T.C.* 21427; reprinted in Arber's *English Reprints.*

[3] Printed by Pynson (*S.T.C.* 7772), it is reprinted in Pratt's edition of Foxe, IV, 676. For the date, see *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, V, 311. Anderson, *Annals of the English Bible* (1845 ed., I, 233), was evidently mistaken in thinking that the proclamation came out at the end of 1529, after Convocation had adjourned. A note in Tunstall's register (Foxe, IV, 778) connects this proclamation with the famous statute enacted in the reign of Henry IV against the Lollards (1401), known as *De heretico comburendo* (Foxe, III, 239).

[4] The Hoochstraten imprints of this early period include: *Parable of the Wicked Mammon* (May 1528) and *Obedience of a Christian Man* (Oct. 1528), both by Tyndale; *Exhortation to the Study of Scripture* by Erasmus, combined with *Exposi-*

tion on the Seventh Chapter of I Corinthians, probably by Roye (June 1529); *Revelation of Antichrist* (July 1529) by John Frith; *Sum of the Holy Scripture*, translated by Simon Fish (1529); Tyndale's Pentateuch (Jan. 1530); *Examination of William Thorpe* and *A Compendious Old Dialogue*, edited by Tyndale (1530); *Dialogue between a Gentleman and a Husbandman*, probably by Barlow (1530); and Tyndale's *Practice of Prelates* (Nov. 1530).

[5] Attributed to Grapheus are Simon Fish's *Supplication for the Beggars* (1528) and Tyndale's *Exposition upon Chapters V–VII of Matthew* (1532?). To Cock's press are now attributed Tyndale's *Answer to Thomas More's Dialogue* (July 1531) and the first edition of Frith's *Disputation of Purgatory* (1531) and of Barnes's *Supplication unto the King* (Nov. 1531). Van Berghen and De Grave had printed almanacs for the English trade, and Van der Haeghen was later (1535) to publish Tyndale's final revision of his New Testament (*S.T.C.* 2830).

[6] For fuller discussion, see C. C. Butterworth, *The English Primers (1529–1545)*, chap. ii and iii.

[7] Recorded originally in Archbishop Warham's register, preserved in the Lambeth Palace Library, the report was reprinted in Wilkins' *Concilia* (III, 727) and in Foxe (Pratt ed., V, 501; VII, 499). In the index to the last-mentioned work, the Primer is gratuitously cited as " 'Primer,' Tyndale's."

[8] More, *The Confutacyon of Tyndales answere*, fol. Bb2.

[9] See C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*, chap. vi.

[10] See below, p. 60–61.

[11] For Joye's use of this material in his second edition of the Primer, see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 38.

[12] Collation: A-I^{8}K-T^{8}V^{8}X-Z^{8}AA-GG^8 (240 leaves). The type is classified as "bastard" by F. S. Isaac; see his *English Printers' Types of the Sixteenth Century*. Only two copies have been preserved, at the British Museum and the Huntington Library. The title is known in two forms, one reading "Feline" and the other "ffeline."

[13] See M. E. Kronenberg, "Notes on English Printing in the Low Countries (Early Sixteenth Century)," *The Library*, 4th ser., IX, 139.

[14] The *Oxford English Dictionary*, under *quetch*, cites the same phrase, "durst not once quitch," from Palsgrave's French wordbook of 1530 (*S.T.C.* 19166) as equivalent to "might not utter a sound." "Mugger" appears to be a form of the dialectal verb "mucker," meaning to hoard or heap together.

[15] Other samples of Coverdale's borrowing may be found in Ps. 31 : 4; 46 : 1; 67 : 2; 119 : 95, 110.

[16] The statement in Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 234, note, to the effect that Godfray's edition omits this prologue is incorrect.

[17] *Practice of Prelates* (*S.T.C.* 24465), fol. R6.

[18] See also A. G. Chester, *Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English*, pp. 57–60. Tyndale's translation was condemned "as well in the Old Testament as in the

New"; and besides the Primer, six other books were cited by name as containing specific heresies: two by Tyndale, two by Simon Fish, and one each by Frith and William Roye. In the ensuing proclamation, specific mention of the Primer was omitted but it was evidently classified as among "diuers other bokes made in the englisshe tonge, and imprinted beyonde the see." The 1530 proclamation is reprinted in Pollard's *Records of the English Bible*, p. 163, and in Foxe, ed. Pratt, Vol. VII, p. [812]; see also *S.T.C.* 7775.

[19] Collation of the *Ortulus anime*: A-I^8, K-S^8 (144 leaves). In the only surviving copy, fol. B3 is missing. For fuller discussion of the contents of Joye's *Hortulus*, see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, chap. iii.

[20] There is plenty of evidence to show that the *Hortulus* of 1530 was by Joye. For further discussion, see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 21.

[21] Bucer's *Historia Supplicii Domini Iesu* was published in 1528 (see C. Hope, "Story of the Passion and Resurrection in the English Primer," *Journal of Theological Studies*). The English version was credited to Joye by Bale in his *Summarium* (fol. 239^v). It was reprinted at least three times during the 1530's, and again as recently as 1916, but never with Joye's name.

[22] Isaiah 63 : 15-64 : 12; I Samuel 2 : 1-10; Daniel 9 : 4-19; Jonah 2 : 1-10.

[23] See Appendix B.

[24] See Appendix B.

[25] For further details see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 42.

[26] Particularly, *S.T.C.* 15986, 15988a, and 15988. See Butterworth, *op. cit.*

[27] See A. G. Chester, *Hugh Latimer*, pp. 61-65.

[28] H. Ellis, *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, Ser. III, II, 208.

[29] *Complanationis Isaiae prophetae, foetura prima, cum apologia qur quidque sic versum sit, per Huldrychum Zuinglium*, printed at Zurich by Froschouer. A prefatory epistle to the reader is dated July 15, 1529. The *complanatio* (parallel texts by Jerome and Zwingli) is followed by a section of *apologia* (or commentary).

[30] The Latin of the Vulgate reads: "Impii autem quasi mare fervens, quod quiescere non potest, et redundant fluctus ejus in conculcationem et lutum. Non est pax impiis, dicit Dominus Deus."

[31] "Ecce opes suas secum aduebit, consiliis, & rebus bene gestis clarus" (p. 69). "Habent Hebraea, Coram eo: sed ea locutione pro triumphali processione visus est uti propheta" (p. 158).

[32] See Appendix B.

[33] For comparison of the two versions in Chapter 35, see Butterworth, *Literary Lineage*, pp. 300-307; and for 6 : 1-8, see Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles*, pp. 55, 94.

5

Mounting Controversy and Persecutions

DURING 1531 Tyndale and Frith and Joye each decided to enter the lists of controversy on behalf of the "new learning" as the tide of persecution continued to rise in England. Since the fall of Wolsey, the chief defender there of the older religion had been Sir Thomas More, the Lord Chancellor, who could count on the support of the bishops of Durham and of London, Cuthbert Tunstall and John Stokesley. More was both an able and a dangerous opponent—able because of his shrewdness, his extensive learning, and his considerable skill as a writer; dangerous because of his deep religious zeal and his espousal of the harsh doctrine that not only the writings of English heretics but also the heretics themselves should be burnt if they could be apprehended and would not recant. As early as 1529 More had presented himself as a champion of the orthodox party by publishing a *Dialogue* directed against the Lutherans, particularly against what he called Luther's gospel and Tyndale's testament. The title page (*S.T.C.* 18084) referred to "the pestylent sect of Luther and Tyndale/ by the tone [i.e., *the one*] bygone in Saxony/ and by the tother laboryd to be brought in to Englond."

In the early part of 1531 Tyndale had been framing a rejoinder to this book and was looking forward to its publication when, in May, More brought out a new edition of his *Dialogue* (*S.T.C.* 18085), with his new dignity appended to the title page: "¶ Newly ouersene by the sayd syr Thomas More chauncellour of England." Thus goaded, Tyndale at length succeeded in having his defense published in the month of July under the title, *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge* (*S.T.C.* 24437).

Meanwhile, young John Frith also joined the fray of controversy. He had guardedly paid a short visit to England in the Lenten season and upon his return seems to have gone to Amsterdam, probably to seek a publisher for Tyndale's *Answer*; but in this he was disappointed. Coming back to Antwerp, he published there, also in the month of July, a work of his own, *The Disputation of Purgatory* (*S.T.C.* 11388), in answer to a book on the subject by John Rastell (*S.T.C.* 20719), and to arguments used against him by Bishop John Fisher and Sir Thomas More. Rastell was More's brother-in-law and publisher of the first edition of More's *Dialogue*; but partly as a result of Frith's endeavors in the course of the next two years Rastell was won over to the side of the reformers.

Meanwhile also, George Joye had been able to procure copies of the letters which Prior John Ashwell had sent to the Bishop of Lincoln about him in the autumn of 1527,[1] and he now set about publishing his reply to the charges of heresy which Ashwell had lodged against him. Martin de Keyser printed the first edition of Joye's reply (*S.T.C.* 845) on June 10, 1531, just a month after his *Prophet Isaiah* had come off the same press. The new book was a small one of 28 leaves (56 pages) rather closely printed, and bore an elaborate title:

> ¶The letters which IOHAN ASHWEL Priour of Newnham Abbey besids Bedforde/ sente secretely to the Bishope of Lyncolne/ in the yeare of our lorde M.D. xxvij. Where in the sayde priour accuseth George Ioye that tyme beinge felawe of Peter college in Cambridge/ of fower [i.e., *four*] opinio*ns*: with the answer of the sayed George vn to the same opinions.

The reverse side of the title page gives a summary of Ashwell's allegations, together with a couple of verses from Proverbs, one of which (26 : 27) is rendered, "He that rolleth a stone shall haue it rolled him agene"—not a bad epitome of all controversy! The book is furnished with a fictitious colophon," ¶ At Straszburge the .10. daye of Iune"; also with a brief *envoi*: ¶ "This litell boke be delyuerd to Iohan Ashwell Priour of Newnham Abbey besyds Bedforde with spede."

Under cover of this false colophon Joye had no reluctance to the printing of his name on the title page, as had also been done with his *Prophet Isaiah*. As mentioned in the preceding chapter, the good will showed to Tyndale by Stephen Vaughan, acting as Cromwell's emissary, gave encouragement to the exiles. Indeed, Dr Mozley has predicated the possibility that it may have been Joye who gave Vaughan information about the *Answer* that Tyndale was preparing to publish against More's *Dialogue*. Whether or not Vaughan was in touch with Joye at this time, he certainly was some two years later, as we shall observe.

We have already recounted what Joye called "The storie of my state," taken from the latter portion of his reply to Ashwell, describing his escape from the toils laid for him by the Bishop of Lincoln. It remains now to say a little of the four "opinions" which Joye rebutted in the body of the work.

The first was "that a simple priest hath as large a*n*d grete powr to bynde and to lose/ as hath a bishope/ or the Bishope of Rome." The issue thus joined lay at the base of most of the discussion over Purgatory. For if the Pope had the derived power to procure the pardon of souls in Purgatory, then the issuance of indulgences for this purpose could be defended. Joye, however, does not meet and resolve this issue. Instead he takes his stand on the proposition that only God's word properly preached can have the power to bind or to loose from sin, and that any priest who preaches the word faithfully has an instrumental part in this power. He writes (fol. A8):

> ¶But as for the keyes which ar the lawe & Gospel preached or redde/for that the one bindeth a*n*d the other loseth the beleuers frome sinne and condemnacio*n*: it nedeth not to dispute whether the Pope hath more powr to lose with preachinge therof then a bishoppe/ or a bishoppe greter then a simple preste. ... the simple sir Ioha*n* is not now lerned and yet if he were

> lerned/ he muste haue their autorite which is harde to be obtayned if he wil preache the truthe Peter & Paule were but pore simple prestis in co*m*parison to our holy father the Pope/ to the moste reuerende Cardinalis gracis/ and to our lordis the bishoppis/ a*n*d yet I thinke they had as grete & as large (as you saie) powr to lose & to binde with preachi*n*ge the worde of god as hath Pope/ cardinal/ bishope/ abbote or priour And as for the scripture/ it putteth no sich differe*n*ce of lordely powers/ nether knoweth it sich lordely and stought namis: but sayth to the*m*/ though the haithen playe the lordis/ yet shal not you be so/ ...

To the second charge, "y*t* faithe is sufficie*n*t withoute werkes," Joye replies that this is not exactly what he said—

> but I might saie that by faith withoute workes a man is iustified. Whiche is Paules sainge in the thirde cap. to the Roma*ns*/ and this I beleue as true with Paule/ and holde it for no*n* opinion. ... Paule as he was going to persecute Christes chirche was smiten downe a murderer and rose agene a iustified man/ which yet had done no good workes/ but only beleued in Jesu Christ that smit him downe and spake vnto him ergo faith only iustified. (B2^{v} and B6).

About the third charge, that "euery preste maye haue a wyfe or a concubine," Joye protests that this entirely misrepresents his opinion, which he then goes on to explain (fol. B6^{v}):

> ... but this I beleue that it is lawful and standeth with holy scripture/ that euery preste which haue not the gyfte of chastite/ ought to haue his owne wife/ & no nother mannis/ nor yet a co*n*cubyne.

In support of this he leans heavily on the seventh chapter of I Corinthians, and he inclines to the Lutheran position, which was that God has purposely implanted sexual desire in man and that chastity is therefore too heavy a demand for most men to be able to observe. He says (fol. C1):

> God at the firste creacion griffed [i.e., *grafted*] in to man and woman as he hath done in to all creatures a certayn secrete natural properte to begete/ to conceyue/ & to bringe forth a nother in like kinde & that lawfully with

> honour. Whiche natural ordinaunce and property it lyeth not in man to altere and to change/ nor yet to put awaye frome his harte the natural love and desyer to the tother kinde whom God created to be his felawe helper vnto this naturall effecte.

The fourth opinion that Ashwell charges against Joye is "that euery laye man maye heare confessions." Joye replies that he never remembers having discussed this topic with the prior; but if he did, he certainly would not have said that every layman had such a right, but only certain ones—those, namely, who exercised it "aftir this forme which Christe prescribeth in the .5. chapter of Mattheu." The reference is to the requirement (Matt. 5 : 24) that if your brother has aught against you, you should go and make your peace with him. Joye, assuming that the offended brother will be gracious, deduces this query: "Do not this laye ma*n* that heareth and forgeueth him heare his confession and absolue him?" (fol. C4). Such an interpretation would never, of course, have satisfied the maintainers of auricular confession, and it does in fact seem like quibbling on Joye's part.

For good measure, he has also something to say on the vexed question of the merits of making pilgrimages to the shrines of famous saints. Sir Thomas More had treated this topic fully in his *Dialogue*, and Ashwell alluded to it in his letters; accordingly, Joye records the prior's allegation along with the four "opinions" cited on the reverse of the title page, thus:

> And because he sayth that I hade men goinge on pilgrimage in derision/ I haue setto the scripture that damneth worshipping of images.

Lastly, just before proceeding to tell "the storie of my state," Joye undertakes to sound a solemn note of warning to the prior (fol. C8):

> For there ar many thingis that threten an heuy fall & change to your Popishe kingdome. The lorde of powers hath decrede to abate the pride of all stoutenes/ & to pluk downe all the grete gloriouse of therthe. Isaie the .23. chapter. It is the worde of God (I tell you yet agene) that thei and you persecute so cruelly. It is Christe who*m* you fight agenst in vayne so blindely/

> and it is the breath of his mouth/ that is to saie his almighty worde that shall destroye you.

This citation from Isaiah brings up an interesting point. No year is given—simply, the tenth of June—in the colophon of Joye's reply to Ashwell. That the year of publication was really 1531 is deducible from two facts: (1) The earliest references to the book date from approximately April, 1532;[2] and (2) though Joye makes obvious use in it of the version of Isaiah which he published in May, 1531, the phraseology seems at times to indicate that some further revision has taken place. In illustration of this point consider a passage from Joye's Prophet Isaiah (65 : 2-4):

> ... for I haue stretchedforthe my handes al this tyme paste vnto a nacion that beleued not whiche goithe not the right waye y*t* is to saye lyueth not aftyr my mynde and plesures/ which also neu*er* ceasseth to exasperat & to anger me eue*n* to my face offeringe their offeringes in groves & wodes & bre*n*ni*n*ge their incense vpo*n* alters made of stone/ sleapi*n*ge al night in chyrches ful of images/...

In his reply to Ashwell, Joye seizes on this same text as suitable for his discussion of going on pilgrimages (fol. C6^{v}), but now he adds a bit of additional color here and there:

> I haue stretched forth my handes al this longe time paste vnto a nacion that forsaketh me/ and seketh straunge goddes/ which nacion gothe not the right waye/ that is to saye not aftir my minde and commaundementes. Vvhich nacion exaspereth and angreth me beynge present/ and yet go they forth/ to offre in groues and wodes/ doinge sacrifices there at autares [i.e., *altars*] of stone/ sittinge and knelinge by toumbes and shrynes/ sleaping in chirches full of images.[3]

It should be borne in mind that the practice of introducing variations into the translation of Scripture instead of following literally some version that was already in print was not peculiar to Joye; it was the contemporary mode. Doubtless Joye embraced the opportunity to indulge his taste for variety, but other writers of the period followed the same practice. In September 1531, for example, Marten de Keyser printed Tyndale's *Exposition* on the First Epistle of St John (*S.T.C.* 24443) —a work in which, when it came to citing the text of the Epistle, Tyndale did not feel obliged to copy exactly the version of I John which he had already published in his New Testament. There were, of course, many parallels and similarities, but there were also fresh renditions.

Meanwhile, news of the soberest sort had been finding its way across the Channel. Sir Thomas More in his post of Lord Chancellor was bearing down on any prominent heretics he could apprehend. Stokesley, Bishop of London, had his eyes on the activities of Thomas Bilney and Edward Crome, both Cambridge men. When Crome was called to account and examined for heresy, he decided to abjure the opinions which were cited against him; but Bilney courted the fire. He preached boldly in Bishop Nix's diocese of Norwich, was arrested, examined, and finally on August 19, 1531, was burnt there in the Lollards' Pit. A little later another of Joye's acquaintances was apprehended: this was Richard Bayfield, who had continued active in the hazardous work of introducing and circulating forbidden books in England. At the end of November he met the fate of a martyr at Smithfield. Bishop Stokesley conducted the examination of Bayfield, a former Benedictine monk, who had taken the degree of B.A. at Cambridge in 1527, and who was now virtually a colporteur for the publications of the reformers at Antwerp. As it happens, we have an interesting contemporary list of about thirty books which—in London on December 3, 1531, under Stokesley's authority—were publicly denounced as heretical, and which would thus no doubt be the works in which Bayfield trafficked.[4] Of Joye's works there were included the "Ortulus anime, in Englissh; The Prymer in Englissh; The Psalter in Englissh."

It is practically certain that Bayfield's arrest resulted from information which Sir Thomas More succeeded in extracting from George Constantine, another of the purveyors of the English New Testament, whom More's agents had apprehended in the autumn of 1531. Constantine was kept in confinement in More's house; and, in fear of his life and the safety of his family, he gave evidence against some of the reformers and told More something of their activities. At last, however, he was able to make his escape and reached Antwerp again on December 6.

From Grafton's account in Halle's *Chronicle*,[5] we learn that Joye's name entered into the exploratory talks which More held with Constantine. The passage reads:

> And this Constantine beyng with More, after diuerse examinacions of diuerse thynges, emong other, Master More saied in this wise to Constantine. Constantine I would haue thee plain with me in one thyng that I will aske of thee, and I promes thee I will shewe thee fauour, in all other thynges, whereof thou art accused to me. There is beyond the sea Tyndale, Ioye, and a great many mo of you, I knowe thei cannot liue without helpe, some sendeth theim money and succoureth theim, and thy self beyng one of them, haddest parte thereof, and therefore knowest from whence it came. I praie thee who be thei that thus helpe them? My lorde quod Constantine, will you that I shal tell you the truthe? Yea I praie thee quod my Lorde. Mary I will quod Constantine, truly quod he it is the Bishope of London that hath holpen vs, for he hath bestowed emong vs, a greate deale of money in New Testamentes to burne theim, and that hath and yet is our onely succoure and comfort.

It is doubtful that this oblique reply satisfied the astute Chancellor; but all that Constantine told him, More noted down and made use of in his next book.

Even Cromwell's emissary to Antwerp, Stephen Vaughan, came under the shadow of More's suspicions. He had been too friendly toward the reformers. When he returned to Antwerp after a stay in England during the autumn of 1531, Vaughan learned that Constantine had informed More of his friendly dealings with Tyndale. Vaughan wrote several letters protesting to Cromwell that in spite of these contacts his religious views had not been contaminated with Lutheranism. But he protested with equal vigor against the short-sighted persecution of the heretics that was being accelerated in England. Moreover, he reported to Cromwell that a new book had been published by Robert Barnes (his *Supplication unto Henry the Eighth—S.T.C.* 1470), and he was probably instrumental in procuring for Barnes a safe-conduct whereby he was allowed to pay a short visit to England without danger of being arrested.

But the early months of 1532 showed no relenting of the persecutions. In January another Cambridge man, Thomas Dusgate, was martyred in Devonshire. And in the same month Hugh Latimer, one of Joye's friends from Cambridge days, was summoned to appear before Bishop Stokesley in London. After protracted hearings before Convocation and an appeal to the King, Latimer was obliged to submit and sign a confession that certain of his acts and words had been erroneous. This was on April 22, 1532. On the last day of that month occurred the martyrdom of James Bainham, whose offense was stubborn adherence to Tyndale's views and public display of his New Testament; but since Bainham had previously been examined before Chancellor More and had recanted, he was now treated as a relapsed heretic and burnt at Smithfield. Among the books in his possession Foxe, undoubtedly referring to Joye's reply to Prior Ashwell, mentions "The epistle of George Ioie."

Sometime during this spring, More put forth the first three books of the monumental controversial treatise he called *The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* (*S.T.C.* 18079). This laborious and long-winded work was eventually to run to hundreds of pages and to include an answer to Barnes as well; but in the prologue to the first portion of it More was occupied in setting down all the information he had been able to glean from his examinations of the heretics brought before him. It is, consequently, one of the most informative reviews we have of the activities of the reformers at Antwerp up to the year 1532.

Concerning Joye, we are told not only that More has heard that he was the author of the English Psalter and the Primer but also more recently of "a goodly godly pystle"—More's ironical description of the reply to Ashwell. From this description it looks as if More had been the one who drew up the list of Bainham's confiscated books mentioned above. Furthermore we are told that Joye has been married, probably, we may suppose, in 1531. The only word we have of this event is in the passage which reads as follows (fol. Aa4):

> Then haue we from George Iaye otherwyse called clerke, a goodly godly pystle/ wherein he teacheth dyuerse other heresyes, but specyally that mennys [i.e., *men's*] vowes and promyses made of chastyte, be not lawfull nor can bynde no man in conscyence, but he may wedd when he wyll.
>
> And thys man ... determyned therfore wyth hym self that he wolde of his preachynge, shew hymself ensample. And therfore beynge preste [i.e., *priest*], he hath bygyled a woman and wedded her/ the pore woman I wene vnware that he ys preste.

We have no information of the name of Joye's wife, nor of whether he married more than once. His only son (so far as we know) was born some twelve years later.

In another interesting passage in the prologue to the *Confutation*, More speculates on the subject of how the reformers abroad were supplied with funds (fol. Bb2^v):

> These felowes that naught had here, and therfore noughte caryed hense, nor nothinge fyndynge there to lyue vppon/ be yet sustayned and mayntened wyth monye sent them by some euyll dysposed persones oute of this realme thyther/ ...

This too is a subject about which we know but little. In view of the severity of persecution, support for the reformers would necessarily be clandestine. How did Joye, for instance, maintain himself and his wife in Antwerp, procure the means to travel occasionally to nearby towns, and at the same time find money enough to bring out his publications? The assumption must be that his earnings as a proofreader (if that is what he was) would hardly have sufficed for all this; therefore he must—like Tyndale, Frith, and Coverdale—have been subsidized from some source. We do know that there was considerable commercial intercourse between the English colonies at Antwerp and Calais and the well-to-do merchants of London. We have reason to suppose that merchants like John Coke, Richard Harman, and Humphrey Monmouth, in their travels to and from London, brought with them not only moral support in favor of the "new learning" but also financial support for its exponents who were exiled from their native land. There was also, as we shall see, an active correspondence maintained between the reformed party in Antwerp and the "brethren" (as they were sometimes called) residing at home. To what extent all this formed an underground network we can only guess. The reformers perhaps had their board and lodging provided for them by sympathetic neighbors, but there seems seldom to have been a lack of means to publish whatever was deemed essential or helpful to the cause.

The first instalment of the *Confutation* was the last work of controversy to come from More's pen while he was still Lord Chancellor. By the middle of 1532 Thomas Cromwell's policy of making Henry supreme in his own realm and alienating him from allegiance to the Pope began to bear fruit. The Parliament that sat from the middle of January to the middle of May took the first step toward transferring supreme authority in matters ecclesiastical from the Church to the Crown when it passed the Act of Annates, whereby the first-year fees of each bishop became payable to the royal treasury. When, on May 15, Convocation followed suit, and turned over its legal jurisdiction to a royal commission, Thomas More read the signs aright and resigned his office the next day. To him belongs the virtue of having been a consistent upholder of the old church, even when it meant the loss of office, and later loss of life, under the King.

Meanwhile Henry cherished the design of setting his paramour, Anne Boleyn, on the throne as Queen. After the death of William Warham, the aged Archbishop of Canterbury, in August 1532 Henry took bolder steps to bring Anne into prominence. In September she was made Marchioness of Pembroke and the next month paid a royal visit with Henry to the King of France. At the same time Thomas Cranmer was recalled to England from his post as ambassador to Charles V, and Thomas Cromwell was made Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The most ominous event of the period was the imprisonment of John Frith. Frith had journeyed to England again in July, and after his presence there became known to the authorities a reward was offered for his capture. He tried to escape but was arrested and committed to the Tower of London, probably in the latter part of October. Thomas More, who retained much of his influence though he had resigned the seals, felt that a great prize had fallen into his hands with the capture of Frith, and he labored earnestly to dissuade him from his heretical views.

Frith was shown certain courtesies while he was lodged in the Tower, particularly in being allowed freedom to write, and he engaged in several controversial exchanges with More. But he made the fatal mistake of committing to writing for an acquaintance a memorandum setting forth his views on the crucial subject of the Lord's Supper; and this memorandum was copied and delivered into More's hands. This must have been soon after he was imprisoned, for More replied in a lengthy printed letter which Frith says he saw for the first time on December 26, 1532, at the house of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who had been Frith's tutor at Cambridge.

At just about this time, near the turn of the year, Tyndale wrote a fatherly letter to Frith[6] advising him not to meddle with the subject of the Sacrament nor take any dogmatic stand on the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. But, even had Frith chosen to heed it, the warning came too late. He had burnt his bridges behind him and, unless he recanted, martyrdom was almost inevitable. He stood his ground, in spite of the efforts of Cranmer and Gardiner to dissuade him, until finally, in the following June, he was called up for examination before Bishop Stokesley.

Tyndale's letter to Frith was likewise intercepted by one of More's agents and a copy was put into More's hands; also a copy of a letter which Joye sent to Frith while he was still in prison. More says the letters urged Frith to be steadfast and to be mindful how greatly the brethren at Antwerp were concerned with Frith's fate. We possess no record of any letter written to Frith by Joye aside from this allusion of More's, which occurs in his *Apology*, printed about March 1533. Here, in dealing with the plea of the well-known legal writer Christopher St Germain that he ought to show greater leniency in his treatment of heretics, More instances the case of Frith, "for he is in pryson in y*e* towre all redy taken by the bishoppes seruauntes," that is, by Stokesley's officers; and he asks what this pacifier (St Germain) proposes to do about him (fol. 151):

> ... especyally whan he shall se certayne letters whyche some of the bretherne lette fall of late, and lost them of lykelyhed [i.e., *likelihood*] as some good kit leseth her kayes [i.e., *loseth her keys*]/ by whiche letters both Tyndale and George Iay wryte vnto Fryth, and counsayle hym to stycke faste/ and Tyndale sheweth hym that all the brethern loke what shall become of hym/ and that vppon hys spede hangeth all theyr hope.[7]

Fortunately the letter which Tyndale wrote to Frith has been preserved in a transcription by John Foxe. It is of interest to our theme because in it Tyndale refers to Joye in such a way as to show that the cleavage between them was growing wider. The part of Tyndale's letter dealing with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper reads as follows:[8]

> Of the presence of Christes body in the Sacrament, medle as litle as ye can, y*t* there apeare no diuision among vs. Barnes will be whote [i.e., *hot*] against you. The Saxo*n*s be sore on the affirmatiue, whether constant or obstinate, I omit it to God. Philip Melancton is saide to be with the French king. There be in Andwarpe that say, they sawe him come into Paris with an c.l. horses, & that they spake with him. If the Frenchme*n* receiue the word of God, he wil plant the affirmatiue in the*m*. George Ioie wold haue put forthe a treatice of the matter, but I haue stopt him as yet, what he wil doo if he get money, I wote not. I beleue he wolde make many reasons lyttle seruing to the purpose. My mynde is, that nothynge bee putt forth tyll we heare howe ye shall haue spedde.

Evidently Tyndale regarded Joye as impetuous and not apt to make much solid contribution by way of controversy in the cause of reform. If we may assume that Joye had any real affinity with the views of Zwingli, who held the sacrament to be merely commemorative and inspirational, then it is likely that Frith would have shared the same views. We learn also from Tyndale's letter that during the latter part of 1532 Joye was not plentifully supplied with funds and so was estopped from rushing into print.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

[1] See above, p. 38.

[2] See *S.T.C.* 18079, fol. Aa4: "Then haue we from George Iaye otherwyse called clerke, a goodly godly pystle"; also Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1563 ed., p. 494; Pratt's ed., IV, 700): "The epistle of George Ioie".

[3] Other examples of Joye's version of Isaiah appearing in his reply to Ashwell are to be found in *S.T.C.* 845 as follows: fol. C7 (Isa. 42 : 8 and 1 : 29-31); fol. C8 (Isa. 21 : 9 and 23 : 9).

[4] The original list is printed in Furnivall, *Political, Religious, and Love Poems* (Early English Text Society, O.S., Vol. 15).

[5] *The union of the . . . famelies York and Lancaster*, fol. 186^{v}. (*S.T.C.* 12722).

[6] In a book which Frith wrote "answeringe vnto M mores lettur," published posthumously (*S.T.C.* 11381), he says of Tyndale (fol. B8^{v}): "I receyuyd a letter from hym/ *which* was wrytyn syns crystmas."

[7] It is worth mentioning that in another portion of More's *Apology* (fol. 45) where he lists the more prominent heretics, Joye's name also appears, but this time it is spelled "George Ioy." Perhaps More called Joye "Jay" deliberately.

[8] Quoted from Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1563 ed., fol. 521); given also in Pratt's 1875 ed., V, 133.

6

Correspondence with England

In spite of the mortal threat hanging over John Frith, the new year of 1533 began auspiciously for the reformers, for on January 25 the King secretly married Anne Boleyn. The King's intention to marry Anne had long been an open secret. As early as Easter of the preceding year, William Peto, provincial of the Gray Friars in England and one of Queen Catherine's associates, had rebuked the King openly for his intention of marrying Anne and had been taken to task by the King and subsequently imprisoned for a while. On the day after Henry's marriage, the post of Lord Chancellor, which had been vacated by More, was conferred upon Thomas Audley. The King then proceeded with his plans to have Thomas Cranmer installed as Archbishop of Canterbury—an event which was finally consummated on March 30.

Anne Boleyn—to whose family Cranmer had at one time been chaplain—is a puzzling figure. Her personal behavior gives little evidence of any religious zeal, yet it is unquestionable that she did exert an influence toward the strengthening of Protestantism. Whether this sprang from religious convictions of her own or was simply reflection of her undoubted hostility toward Cardinal Wolsey and toward Henry's former queen, Catherine of Aragon, it is difficult to judge. It may be significant that her family connections, though ambitious, were thought to be adherents of the "new learning."

The goal of Anne's ambition was to be Henry's queen, yet the marriage was so secret that Cranmer protested that more than a fortnight had elapsed before he even heard of it. And it was not until

April 12, 1533, the day before Easter, that Anne's royal status was openly acknowledged. By this time she was four months pregnant with the future Queen Elizabeth.

It is doubtful, therefore, if news of Henry's marriage could have reached across the Channel before March or April. But the final replacement of Thomas More by Thomas Audley in the Chancellor's post, toward the end of January, may have given fresh stimulus to the reformers in Antwerp. For when we next hear of George Joye it is early in February, at Candlemas time, when he is seeking royal support for the ambitious project of translating the whole Bible.

This news was conveyed to John Frith in a letter which Tyndale wrote to him about the middle of May. After encouraging Frith to stand fast in the face of impending martyrdom, Tyndale speaks in a postscript of fresh persecutions that had broken out on the Continent, and he continues:

> George Joye at Candelmas being at Barrowe printed two leaues of Genesis in a great forme, & sent one copie to the king, & another to the new Quene, with a letter to N. for to deliuer them, & to purchase licence that he might so go through al the Bible. Out of that is spro*n*g the noyse of the new Bible. And out of that is the great seking for English bookes, at al printers and booke bynders in Andwarpe, and for an English priest that should printe. This chaunced the ix. day of May.[1]

We are warranted in concluding from this reference to Joye, first, that something had given him hope that the time was ripe to broach the question of an authorized edition of the Scriptures, though it is plain that Tyndale felt that this was premature; and second, that although Joye had money to go to Bergen, where book fairs were occasionally held, he was still in need of financial aid if he were to launch any new publication. Nothing came of the venture, however, and the two leaves of Genesis, which he is said to have had printed there, have never been discovered.[2]

As the prestige of Anne Boleyn ascended, the influence of Thomas More declined. After he was released from office, he gave himself whole-heartedly to carrying on his religious controversies. Among other books, he published the second part of his voluminous *Confutation*, and this was followed by his *Apology*, which probably appeared in March. In the latter work, as we have noticed, More made some definite allusions to Joye and his activities.

While More was thus busy with new publications, Tyndale also took the field. Considering the plight of John Frith, who was still imprisoned in the Tower, and evidently feeling that the fate of his young friend was virtually sealed, he decided to come to his support with the publication of a small treatise on the Lord's Supper. Published on April 5, this was a brief but vigorous and well-wrought statement of Tyndale's own views of the sacrament, based largely on the sixth chapter of John. To it, near the end of the year 1533, More composed a reply.

Since the topic was dangerous in the extreme, as Frith's experience had already shown, Tyndale's *Souper of the Lorde* (*S.T.C.* 24468) was published anonymously. When the book appeared there was doubt as to whether its author had been Tyndale or Joye; for Tyndale had written to Frith (it will be recalled) that Joye wanted to put forth something on the subject. While modern scrutiny has pretty well established the fact of Tyndale's authorship,[3] the nearly contemporary John Bale, in his *Summarium* of British writers (1548), ascribes the work to Joye.[4] But Thomas More, in his *Answer*, published early in 1534 (*S.T.C.* 18077), says plainly that he does not know which man is the author. He plays upon this anonymity with wordy banter, making it appear that the writer was ashamed to put his name to such a treatise. Discussing the possibility that Joye might have been its author, he says (fol. Aa7^v-Bb2):

> Howe be yt some of the brethern reporte that the booke was made by George Iay. ...
>
> And in very dede, dyuerse that are lerned and haue redde the booke, reken yt verely to be the booke of George Iaye, whereof Tyndale wrote vnto Fryth/ specyally by certayn wordes that were in that letter, For therin

> wryteth Tyndale, that yf George Iay dyd put forth his boke, there shold be founden in it many reasons & very few to the purpose.
>
> Howe be yt me thynketh by that marke, that this boke sholde not be that. For in this boke be there very fewe reasons, and of them all neuer one to the purpose. ...
>
> Dyuerse there are in dede, of those that are lerned and haue redde the boke, that thynke for the lacke of lernynge and of wytte also, that they fynde euery where therin, the booke sholde neyther be made by Tyndale nor by George Iay neyther/ but rather by some yonge vnlerned fole.
>
> Howe be it as for me, I thynke the boke myghte be for all that made by Tyndale or by George Iaye eyther. ...
>
> And some of the bretherne that say this new worke was made by George Iay, thynke that the cause why he sette not his name therto, was bycause he wyst well the brethern dyd not regarde hym.

While Frith was in the Tower the channels of correspondence between him and his friends in Antwerp were evidently not altogether closed. The only specimens of this interchange which remain are the two letters of Tyndale already cited. But on April 29, 1533, Joye wrote a letter to Hugh Latimer in which he says that Frith has taken exception to something which Joye wrote to another correspondent on the subject of the resurrection and the state of souls after death. The letter to Latimer is the only letter certainly by Joye which is now extant. It presents many points of difficulty as well as of interest. Certain of the allusions in it are plain; others are quite obscure. We know too little of the specific background of events to be always sure of the interpretation. And even the very form in which the letter is preserved gives rise to further question.

Joye addresses Latimer as a good friend. We do not know how far this feeling was reciprocated. He makes what seems, at first sight, to be a reference to the trouble Latimer had had when he was examined by Convocation just one year before. But what Joye means by the "burning" which Latimer endured is one of the puzzles in the letter. Perhaps it is no more than an analogy drawn from Paul's warning to the Corinthians (I Cor. 3 : 13-15), which is cited by Joye. It is more likely that Joye had heard of the recent stir caused by Latimer's sermons at Bristol,[5] and his appeal to the examples of Paul and Moses might be intended to assuage any chagrin that Latimer may have felt over the popular reaction to these sermons. There is also allusion to the difficulties of correspondence and mention of a letter written by Joye of which nothing remains. Joye also refers to Thomas Cranmer as though he were in the circle of their mutual acquaintance and takes cognizance of his recent elevation to the post of Archbishop. There are also, of course, remarks on what might be called the main theme of the letter, the state of souls after death.

The text of the letter deserves to be quoted entire. In the manuscript, the two words shown below in parentheses were struck out:

> M*r* L. I hartely co*mm*end me unto youe desiring allmighty god to be p*re*sent wythe you w*ith* his spirytt of trewythe to lede youe in to him that said I am the trewythe and is all trewythe. S*ir*, Will*ia*m Tindall receyvyd a lett*er* frome John ffrythe wherin John ffrythe is somewhat offendyd for that I wrote secretly a letter to one that askyd me a questione as concernyng why I translatyd the prayer of Esaie not all alyke in the hortul*us* and in the p*ro*phete wherin incidently I shew by the diu*er*sitie of translac*io*ns what p*ro*fytt may come therof/ that the sowles dep*ar*tyd slepe not nor lye ydle tyll domes daye as Martin luther and the Anabaptyst*es* saye and as me thinkythe ffrythe and Will*ia*m tyndall wolde/ this lett*er* of myne I desyre youe to see/ for it is so paynefull to me to wryte y*t* I coulde not leve any copye w*ith* me/ ye shall haue yt among the bretherne I cannot tell his name that askyd me the questione and vnto whome I sent the lett*er*. but I sent itt by one Will*ia*m hill M*r* Cosens s*er*vau*nt*. I beseche youe gett gett [*sic*] itt and rede ytt and send me yo*ur* Iudgement and mynd in the matt*er*/ for ffrythe wrytythe y*t* (is) it is lyke to gendre dissensione. but I thynke that o*ur* sowles departyd lyve and doubt not but the scriptures so sowne [i.e., *sound*]/ bothe in chrystes answer to the saduceys Marc. 12. et c. 2 cor 5. philipp. 1. Jo. 23. et c. this berer shall gett yt for youe callyd henry smythe. I wolde wryte vnto youe more but this berer goethe hastely hense and may not tarye me/ god p*re*s*er*ve youe and praye for me/ I forgett youe not neyther yo*ur* good mynde toward me/ I was full sory when I hard of that fyer that ye sufferyd wherof Paule spekythe

> 1 cor. 3. to see your worke burnyd befor your face/ but be of good chere Mr latymer. Paule sufferyd as gret a burnyng as that when he sawe his dull galathans [i.e., *Galatians*] bewychyd and borne backe/ god is myghty ynoughe to bryng them agayne and to gyve youe great glorye and Joye upone your childerne borne and trauelyd so for agayne/ suche is the chaunce and fortune of them that must play the pastures and leaders of chrystes unrewlye flockes. What sufferyd Moyses of his owne flocke? and yet god brought all to a good ende/ and was glorified in (his) him and his flocke to/ Wryte to my lorde of Canterbury and animate him to his offyce. he is in a perellose place/ but yet in a gloriose place to plant the gospell. god preserue youe/ the 29 daye of apryll
>
> Yours as he was wont george Joye.

This letter is preserved in the Public Record Office,[6] written on a good-sized sheet of paper which contains also, immediately below, another, shorter letter on the same topic and in the same hand, but over the name of John Coke, one of the English merchant-adventurers residing in Antwerp. Attached to this sheet is a second, smaller one, blank except for an inscription in a different hand, reading: "George Joye to Mr Latymer affirminge that Soules lye not ydle untill domes daye."

The subjoined letter, the one ostensibly by John Coke, only adds to our bewilderment. It reads as follows:

> Brother William I hartely commend me unto youe/ I was not content that ye breake so sodenly awaye and tooke not wythe youe my letters as ye promised me. Syr I sent a letter as concerning the answer to him that wolde know why the prayer of Esaie so varyed in the primer and the prophete and left my self no copye of whiche letter it is thought that dissensions among the wyse bretherne begynne to growe. I pray youe in any wyse monyshe him unto whome ye delyveryd ytt of this folye/ and byd him in any wyse to send me the letter agayne or els a copie thereof/ and byd him as ever I shall do for him to take hede howe they expounde and descant upon so playne a matter—and byd him send Mr latymer a copye therof. Remember my woode and my chese &c. God preserue youe. the 29 daye of Apryll.
>
> Your John Coke.

James Gairdner, editor of the *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*, assumes that both the letters on the larger sheet are originals in the handwriting of Joye, and he conjectures that the letter from Coke, which he thinks Joye had copied out for Latimer to peruse, may have been addressed to William Tyndale. Mozley, who adopted Gairdner's hypothesis in his discussion of the matter,[7] is led thereby into some tortuous interpretations of the wording given in the second letter.

The more the matter is studied, the greater becomes the conviction that what we have here are copies of two letters both of which were originally composed by Joye. It is true that we cannot satisfactorily account for the appearance of the name of John Coke at the bottom of the second. Perhaps what happened was that someone (possibly one of Cromwell's ubiquitous informers) intercepted these two letters, copied them out for his superior's information, and then sent them on their way again. Indeed, the memorandum on the smaller sheet may have been Cromwell's own notation for his files. We know that in some similar way More was furnished with a copy of Tyndale's letter to Frith. The question of how Coke's name got into our second letter is, of course, full of difficulty either way. Yet it is at least conceivable that the copyist might have misread the signature at the bottom of the letter; or even that Coke may have played some part in making the letters available for copying, and thus had his name brought into the record.

But these are at best weak suppositions, and there are, on the other hand, some considerations which suggest that the letters as we have them are copies: (1) Joye complains that writing is so painful to him that he cannot make a copy of his own letter and that the bearer (Henry Smith) "goeth hastily hence and may not tarry me": is it likely, then, that he would copy off for Latimer another letter that adds no fresh information to what has already been conveyed? (2) The two erasures in the first letter are such as would be natural to a copyist, unless we suppose that Joye was writing carelessly because he was in such a hurry. (3) It is hard to believe that one as familiar with the New

Testament as Joye seems to have been would have made so ignorant a mistake as referring to the twenty-third chapter of John in his list of citations about the resurrection. Surely Joye would have known that John's Gospel has only twenty-one chapters! But it is quite possible that what Joye intended (and in fact may have written) was a reference to John 5 and to Acts 23; for he cites both these passages later in his controversy with Tyndale on the same subject.[8] A copyist, however, might easily have produced "John 23" through omission of part of Joye's citations.

A stronger argument that both the letters were of Joye's own composing is in the similarity of phrasing used when he is speaking of the prayer of Isaiah. Note that both letters, written on the same day, use the same curious turn of speech, "as concerning." One says:

> I wrote secretly a letter to one that askyd me a questione as concernyng why I translatyd the prayer of Esaie not all alyke in the hortul*us* and in the p*ro*phete ...

and the other says:

> I sent a lett*er* as *con*cerning the answer to him that wolde know why the prayer of Esaie so varyed in the p*ri*mer and the p*ro*phete ...

In both cases the writer says that he left himself no copy of that secret letter. It is also interesting to observe that in the letter to Latimer the earlier of Joye's two books is called by its name of *Hortulus*; in the second letter it is called simply a primer. Latimer, as one of Joye's friends, might have been expected to be acquainted with the book.

If, then, we may adopt the bold hypothesis that both these letters of April 29, 1533, were really by Joye, it is likely that the second one, addressed to "Brother William," was intended for the William Hill whom he mentions as having been the bearer of the unfortunate letter which precipitated all the discussion. Then the sequence of events is clear enough: Joye was asked by someone, whom he deemed it unsafe to name,[9] why it was that he printed different translations of the prayer of Isaiah. In his reply he launched unadvisedly into a discussion of his favorite topic of the state of souls after death. This reply was duly delivered by William Hill to a young man, who showed it to John Frith. Frith sensed that harm might come if doctrinal dissensions were fomented among the brethren, and so notified Tyndale. Joye, hearing of this, desired to enlist support, or at least to obtain an impartial opinion, from Hugh Latimer; but there was difficulty in getting the troublesome letter into Latimer's hands. So he wrote to Latimer that he had arranged with the bearer, Henry Smith, to procure him a copy of it. Also he wrote to William Hill, the bearer of the secret letter, to clear the matter with the young man "unto whome ye delyv*er*yd ytt" and see that a copy was furnished to Latimer.

In typical vein, Joye complains that neither bearer—Smith or Hill—would allow him the time he needed to get his letters off. It is also characteristic of Joye that he should seek to warn the young man who received the letter of the folly of spreading dissension, especially on a matter that was so plain and unequivocal to Joye. It is likely that Joye's letter to the young man did come to Latimer's attention; for Joye later wrote in his *Apology* that by that time (February 1535) he had by him "the copye of my letters sent unto this man," which "went thorow many handis as I vnderstode aftir." So presumably Latimer was among those who saw a copy of the letter; but we know nothing more of the sequel.

The so-called prayer of Isaiah—innocent occasion of all these speculations—was one of the *Precationes Biblicae* which Otto Brunfels compiled from the Latin Vulgate. Apparently, the prayer has nothing to do with the disputed topic of the resurrection. As mentioned before,[10] it appears printed in English for the first time in Joye's *Hortulus* (probably also in his lost Primer). Then when he put forth his version of the whole book of Isaiah, the prayer was duly translated again, but this time from the Latin of Zwingli. This explains how Joye came to do two variant versions. Though these are indeed divergent, both bear the hallmarks of Joye's style, as may be seen by comparing them in the following excerpts from the opening verses of Isaiah 64. In the *Hortulus* (fol. K1^{v}) this reads:

> I wolde thou woldist al tobreke hevens & come downe wons [i.e., *once*] y*t* theis hyllis might melte awaye at thy presens as in y*e* brennynge of a consuminge fyer/ where even water boyllethe oute fyer: that thi name might be knowne to thyne enymes/ & theis vngodly might be shamed and troubled at thi presens. Whe*n* thou wroughtist meruelous thinges for vs/ then we loked not for them. Thou camst downe and the hilles wasted awaye with tre*m*bling before thy face. And frome y*e* begi*n*nynge harde thei not/ nor perceived with their earis/ nether with eny eye was the*re* sene eny God besydis the to have wroghte syche mervels/ a*n*d that to men whiche waited not for the.

In the *Prophet Isaiah* the same passage reads:

> I wolde thow woldest cleve insondre heaue*n* and come downe that the hylles mought melte awaye at thy presens even as agenst an hotte fyer a*n*d that the violent tyra*n*ts mought be set a fyer as is water inflammedde with fyer: that thy name mought be knowne vnto thy enymes/ a*n*d these haithen mought tremble at thy presens. Descende (I saye) with thy woundreful & vnwonte workes vnlokedfore that these hilles mought consume in thy syghte: For from al tymes paste there was noman that wolde heare or take hede/ nether beholde with his eyes these thinges which thou haste done for men waytinge for the: but thow a lone (O god) thou helpest hym. . . .

Joye was not the sort who would be troubled by such obvious variations: indeed, as he intimated to Latimer, he felt that there might be some advantage in a diversity of versions.

To return now to our story, it was sometime during the spring of 1533, probably in May, when King Henry decided that something should be done about the heretic John Frith who was imprisoned in the Tower.[11] Accordingly, Frith was summoned before Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Gardiner. Cranmer not only tried to persuade him to change his stand on the subject of transubstantiation but, if Foxe's story is to be believed, even encouraged his agents to allow Frith to escape. But Frith had decided to see it through, and Cranmer somewhat reluctantly turned him over to Stokesley, Bishop of London, about the middle of June. He was sentenced as a heretic and went to the flames on July 4, 1533.

Meanwhile, Cranmer had been busy also with the "great matter" of Henry's marriage. Toward the end of May he conducted a formal hearing, which Catherine of Aragon refused to attend: whereupon her marriage to Henry was declared annulled, and a few days later the marriage to Anne Boleyn was confirmed. On the first day of June Anne was crowned Queen in an elaborate ceremony at Westminster Abbey.

The Pope, Clement VII, had not yet pronounced the mind of the Church on these matters. His vacillation was due, not to indecision about the question itself, but rather to the uneasy struggle of power politics which was being waged, sometimes with startling shifts of policy, among the chief rulers of Europe, namely, the Emperor Charles V and the Kings of England and of France. At length, in July 1533, it was reported that Clement had drawn up a sentence of excommunication against Henry, which would go into effect in September unless the King had meanwhile restored Catherine to the throne and renounced his connection with Anne Boleyn. But the report was premature. Clement, acutely conscious of his own political weakness at home, deferred announcing any decision in the matter of Henry's marriage until the following spring; and it was left to Clement's successor to carry into effect a bull of excommunication against the English King.[12]

Catherine of Aragon had active supporters in England: it was known that both Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More espoused her cause; and so did many other adherents of the old order, especially certain of the friars. These latter maintained an organized propaganda in behalf of the former Queen and of the Pope, spreading their views through sermons and books, and communicating with one another under cover of their religious brotherhood. Cromwell, as the King's minister, was not unaware of this, and from time to time a few of the friars were arrested and examined to see whether their actions were seditious. Two Franciscans—William Peto of Greenwich (afterwards a cardinal) and another named Elston, of Canterbury—fled from England and established themselves at Antwerp, where they were busily superintending the publication of a Latin treatise upholding Catherine's rights under the canon law of Rome.

We learn of this from Cromwell's emissary, Stephen Vaughan, who in the summer of 1533 was appointed to represent the King at the courts of the Dukes of Bavaria and Saxony. On the way to his post Vaughan was instructed to stop off in Antwerp and find out what Peto and Elston were doing. On August 7,[13] he wrote a long letter to Cromwell setting forth what he had been able to learn and disclosing that the source of his information about the two friars and their "counsel and secrecies" was none other than George Joye, whom Vaughan had interviewed. It seems plain from the tone of the letter that Joye had made a bargain with him that he would supply the information Vaughan desired provided Vaughan would speak a good word for him to Cromwell and the King.

In his letter Vaughan reports that he set out promptly to learn who were the promoters of "a book prynted in laten in the towne of Andwerp agenst the kynges greate matter" (that is, against the divorce of Catherine). He continues:

> So that after some polycie by me therin vsed at laste I lerned of one George Gee fled out of Englond for the new lernyng (as they call it) and Resident in Andwerp some part of the counsayll and secresyes of fryer Peto and other his companyons whiche they wolde not for any treasure shulde be bewrayed/ ... Peto and one fryer Elston of Cantorbury beyng the only men that haue and do take vpon them to be conveyers of the same bookes into englond/ ...
>
> Peto labourethe busylier then a bee in the settyng foorthe of this booke ... One of the same bookes I founde means to gett by the forsayde George Gee who undoubtedly is a right honest and true subiect to the Kyng and wolde haue advertised yow of all this matter thoughe I had not asked his knowlage/

> were it not that the man ferythe to wryt/ beyng somuche brought in the hatered of his prynce at my first spekyng withe him he brought me a letter whiche he had wrytten and durst not send.

Further on in the letter Vaughan returns to this subject:

> I haue spoken to George Gee that he shulde in myne absence aduertise yow from tyme to tyme what he shall lerne in the counsayll*es* of Pato and his complices whome yowe maye ryght well trust and take for an honest and feythfull subiect of the Kynges.

But Vaughan's protestations of Joye's fealty to the King fell on deaf ears; for when the letter came into Cromwell's hands, someone (perhaps Cromwell himself) went carefully over it as though in preparation for reading it to the King, and removed every favorable allusion to Joye's name. Only the introductory mention of his name ("I lerned of George Gee fled out of Englond," etc.) was permitted to stand. Thereafter either the name was struck out or the passage was marked in the margin to be omitted. Thus, where Vaughan wrote, "George Gee sayethe that," there is a substitution written in: "Oon [i.e., *one*] tolde me that," etc. The passage telling how Joye is afraid to write a letter to the King is struck through entirely; while the final passage cited above has the notation "Owt" written beside it in the margin.

Various other matters (some of them extraneous) were likewise marked to be omitted pending some official reading of the letter, but it appears that Joye's name was canceled out as a matter of policy. We can only surmise that his application, earlier in the year, for permission to translate the whole Bible, together with the prevalent notion that he was the author of a suspected treatise on the Lord's Supper, made Cromwell feel that it would be impolitic to bring up his name before the King in any context of approbation.

When Vaughan came back to Antwerp after finishing his diplomatic mission into Germany, he wrote again to Cromwell on the twenty-first of October. This time there is no mention of Joye by name. Nevertheless one passage in this letter, referring simply to "an honest man," suggests that Vaughan had further recourse to Joye for information about Peto and his doings.[14] It reads:

> I am enfourmed credibly by an honest man, that a boke, whiche Peto and his complices have made ageynst the Kynges mariage, ... they brought vnto Tyndall in Andwerp, and desyred hym to correct it; whiche he refused to do, saing that he wolde no farther medle in his Prynces mater, ne wolde move his people agenst hym, sythe [i.e., *since*] it was done.

Incidentally, this persistent activity of Peto and his accomplices against the King's "great matter" gives color to the assumption that it might have been these men who were the real culprits in what Tyndale had described some months before, in his letter to Frith, as "the great seking for English bookes, at al printers and booke bynders in Andwarpe, and for an English priest that should printe." Tyndale blamed the disturbance on Joye's project of printing the entire Bible, but conceivably the search "for an English priest that should printe" was aimed at William Peto.

Another echo of Joye's name comes to us from the correspondence of this period, and again it is connected with the celebrated case of John Frith. One of those who endeavored, during the last days of Frith's imprisonment, to dissuade him from his unorthodox views was young Germayne Gardiner, a nephew of the Bishop of Winchester. This younger Gardiner was a staunch proponent of the Roman Catholic theology and he visited Frith in prison and labored unsuccessfully to prevail upon him. Then to show how earnestly he had tried, and how stubborn was Frith's adherence to his heresies, Gardiner wrote a letter on the first of August—not quite a month after Frith's martyrdom—setting forth the history of their encounter. This letter was deemed important enough by the orthodox party to be worth publishing, and a printed edition of it (*S.T.C.* 11594) was put forth by More's publisher, William Rastell, shortly after the beginning of the new year of 1534.

The letter was directed to Edward Fox, who had been one of Joye's acquaintances at Cambridge and who was later to befriend Joye at a critical time. Gardiner reminds Fox that Frith had been a scholar at King's before he was transferred to Oxford, where he got into trouble and then fled overseas; and this leads him to mention Joye as another of Fox's friends who had succumbed to the German religion. The relevant passages read:

> Ye haue herde howe Ioh*a*n Fryth somtyme scoler in that colledge wherof ye were after his departyng mayster, was afterwarde amonges other at Oxenforde found besye in settyng abrode these hersyes, whyche lately spronge in Almayne [i.e., *Germany*] ...
>
> And he beyng therfore for his ame*n*dment punyshed, of obstinatie [i.e., *obstinacy*] fledde ouer the sees vnto the fathers of that relygyon/ where in the company of wyllyam Tyndale, George Ioy, (at whose name I am sure ye sygh, seing your self to haue ben so deluded with the hope whyche ones ye conceyued of hym) and other heretykes: he profyted so myche in a whyle in vngraciouse vnshamefast boldnes, that beynge not myche aboue the age of xxiiii. yeres, y*e* arrogant fole nothynge doutynge the iudgement of the hole worlde, toke vpon hym to teache the hole chyrche of Chryste, reuokynge vs from our errour (as he calleth yt) of purgatorye, ...

Toward the end of the letter, Gardiner, musing on the sad end of Frith, glances again at Tyndale and Joye:

> Thus ye se what ende his pryde & arrogaunce, confermed wyth the deuelyshe [i.e., *devilish*] flaterynge of Tyndale and Ioye with such other, not onely praysynge his lernynge vnto hym more than ynough, but also wrytyng that in hym and his successe was all theyr hope and truste, hath brought thys myserable wreche vnto.

These are but passing references, to be sure, but they illustrate two points: (1) the association of the names of Tyndale and Joye together at this period in the thoughts of their opponents; and (2) the likelihood that Edward Fox took some special interest in Joye while they were together at Cambridge. Concerning Germayne Gardiner, it suffices to say that he remained loyal to his convictions: later in Henry's reign, his zeal laid him open to charges of treason, which he paid for with his life in 1544.

This is a convenient place to bring to the reader's notice a little-known publication that appeared in 1533 (probably near the end of the year) from the press of Marten de Keyser in Antwerp. It was a small devotional book entitled *The Mystik sweet Rosary of the faythful soule.*[15] Though it makes no mention of Joye's name, this little volume betrays a certain affinity with his works. Indeed Joye may even have supplied the printer with an English rendering of the book, translated from an earlier Latin edition.

At the end of its long and elaborate title it bore the imprint: "¶ Prynted in Anwerpe at Martyne Emprowers. M.D. & xxxiij." The willingness of De Keyser to let his name thus appear on the title page in its English equivalent implies that he did not regard the work as controversial; and in appearance it was all very orthodox and unassuming. Yet it contained, beneath a series of woodcuts illustrating the life of Christ, a selection of passages from the Scriptures translated into English, and it is these which make the *Rosary* akin to our subject.

Most of them, as was natural, were taken from the four Gospels, and here the influence of Tyndale's version of the New Testament is plainly felt; yet there is hardly a passage in which the wording does not diverge from Tyndale's at one point or another. Moreover, half a dozen of the excerpts are drawn from the Old Testament, and these show a noteworthy resemblance to the versions that Joye had already published—particularly to his *Prophet Isaiah* (1531) and the prayer of Jonah which he included in his Primer. Not only so, but certain original touches in the Gospel passages, where these depart from Tyndale's text, suggest the version of the Passion which Joye had included in his *Hortulus Animae* (1530).

To run over the evidence briefly: there are several places in which the word "bishop" is applied to the high priests Annas and Caiaphas, and this same usage can be observed in the *Hortulus*. For example, on fol. D6 of the *Rosary* we read, "... one of the bisshops ministers stondinge bye gaue Iesus a blowe/ sayng: Answerst thou thus the Bisshop?"; and in the *Hortulus Animae* (fol. D6) we have: "... one of the Byshopes servantes thinkinge to do his Master a pleasure gave Iesus a blowe of theare [i.e., *the ear*]/ sayinge/ th*us* answerste thou my lorde the byshope?" What Tyndale described as the "purpyll roobe" put upon Jesus (Matt. 27 : 28) appears in the *Hortulus* as "a redde robe" (fol. F2) and in the *Rosary* as "a rede cloke" (fol. E4^{v}). Another typical touch is the use of the word "stiffly" in the account of the accusation of Jesus, which is given thus in the *Rosary* (fol. E2): "But the hyghe Priestis & the Scrybes stept forth stiffely accusing him." Compare the use of a similar term in the *Hortulus*, when Peter is challenged at the time of his denials (fol. D7^{v}): "... and one of them sayed stefly vnto hym: ..."

What we have noticed before, namely that Joye was not averse to making use of his published versions of the Scriptures and revamping them to suit his turn, is illustrated again in the *Rosary*. Consider, for example, the words that Joye used in his *Isaiah* to describe the character of the Messiah (53 : 5, 7):

> ... when he is wounded euen of our transgressions & thus smyten for our vngodlynes/ ... he shalbe led lyke a lambe to be offred vp/ & shalbe as styl as a shepe vnd*er* hyr clyppers handes & shal not ons [i.e., *once*] opene his lippes.

When this same passage is called for in the *Rosary* (fol. E8^{v}) it appears thus:

> It was he that was wounded of our transgressions & thus smyten for our vngodlynes. He was led lyke a lambe to be offred vp/ as styll as a shepe vnder the clippers handis not once openinge his mouthe.

Surely there is some kinship between these two translations.

Similarly with the prayer of Jonah (2 : 2, 6), the translation that Joye had given in his *Hortulus* (fol. K6^{v}) reads:

> Even from the belye of hell I kryed/ and thou hardest my voyce. ... I

> sanke downe vnder the foundacions of the hilles/ so that the waters barred me oute from therthe for ever.

That in the *Rosary* (fol. G2^{v}) reads:

> Euen frome the bely of hell I cried and thou hardst my prayer. I sunke downe vnder the foundacions of the hillis and was barred with waters from the erthe for euer.

Full of perplexity, however, is another passage from the Old Testament as rendered in the *Rosary* (fo. G6^{v}). This is taken from the Song of Solomon (6 : 10), of which no earlier version in English had been produced in this period. Here our translator was on his own, so to speak, and he comes up with this unusual rendition:

> Vvhat is she that thus comethe forthe lyke the morni*n*g rose/ fayer as the moon/ electe as the sonne/ terrible as the set fronte of a castell. Canti. vj.

No doubt this was based on the Vulgate Bible as adapted for use in the Latin edition of the *Rosary*. "Electe as the sonne" translates the Latin literally, *electa ut sol*. The final clause is perhaps not unlike Joye's workmanship; but what are we to make of the questionable rendering, "comethe forthe lyke the morni*n*g rose"? For whereas the English wording suggests some sort of floral allusion to the early rose, the Vulgate makes it plain that it was the rising of the dawn which was the basis of the simile (*aurora consurgens*). If Joye indeed bears any responsibility for such an un-English specimen as this, it does him little credit. The most charitable construction we can put upon it (if it is really his) would be to suppose that he was working hastily and carelessly, as on some distasteful piece of literary hackwork.

All in all, it seems likely that Joye did have some hand in the production of the *Mystik sweet Rosary*, though his part in it may not have extended to seeing the book through the press. The book itself is more curious than instructive. Not only does it show definite links with certain of Joye's translations; it may also stand as a sample of the kind of thing to which Joye turned his hand in an effort to gain employment among the printers of Antwerp.

Conceivably, it was the wages he earned from such jobs as this that provided him with funds for his next publication. For some time he had evidently been meditating a reply to Sir Thomas More. Certain personal aspersions that More had printed both in his *Confutation* and in his *Apology* had nettled Joye, who seems to have put together an answer to More during the latter months of 1533; but he was not able to get it published until early the next year. Thomas More, likewise, could not now find so ready an outlet for his own writings as he had been able to command while still in public office. Yet early in 1534, when More's publisher, William Rastell, put into print the letter of Germayne Gardiner concerning Frith, Rastell also printed (in similar format) the reply that More had written to the anonymous treatise on the Lord's Supper. More had composed this during 1533, and we have already quoted from it. In its printed form (*S.T.C.* 18077) it was entitled:

> The aunswere to the fyrst parte of the poysened booke whiche a namelesse heretyke hath named the souper of the lorde.

But when Joye at length took up the cudgels against More, he had nothing to say of More's latest work, having evidently finished his manuscript before More's *Answer* was made public. Instead he concentrates his attention on More's earlier work, the *Confutation*, in which was set forth the Roman Catholic doctrine of the "unwritten verities." This doctrine held that, in addition to the written Scriptures, the Church had preserved certain dogmas handed down from the apostles through oral tradition which therefore possessed an authenticity similar to that of the Scriptures themselves. One example of such a dogma—in fact, one that Joye adduces in the course of his argument (fo. B6^{v})—is belief in the assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven, a belief sanctioned by the Catholic Church but not grounded in the Scriptures. In common with other reformers, who took their stand on the written Word as the only ground of sound Christian doctrine, Joye sought particularly to undermine Sir Thomas More's position in defense of the Church's "unwritten verities."

In the naming of his new book Joye indulged his penchant for fanciful titles:

> The Subuersion of Moris false foundacion: where vpon he sweteth to set faste and shoue vnder his shameles shoris [i.e., *shorings*]/ to vnderproppe the popis chirche: Made by George Ioye.

To this title Joye adds (not too adroitly) the following gibe: "Moros in Greke is stultus in Latyn/ a fool in Englysshe." Unquestionably this is a tasteless echo of Erasmus' friendly pun in the title of his delightful *Moriae Encomium*—"The Praise of Folly"—which was dedicated to More.

Though Joye permitted his name to stand on the title page, the colophon of his new book is again fictitious.[16] Actually it was printed in Antwerp, probably by Godfried Van der Haeghen. It must have been issued early in the year, certainly before the end of March, since it makes no mention of the momentous events of that month.

In presenting his argument against "unwritten verities" Joye states More's position as follows (fol. A2^{v}):

> That ye apostels left many thingis vnwryten whiche ar of necessite to be beleued. Whiche vnwriten verites (as he calleth them) thapostles delyuered by mouthe to their successours/ and these so from hande to hande vntil thei came to Moris chirche/ ... and euen at laste vnto the holy mayde of kent Moris miracle maker.

This allusion to the Maid of Kent helps us to establish the date of Joye's *Subversion*; for the celebrated case of Elizabeth Barton, a servant girl who became a nun, was brought before Cranmer in July 1533. She claimed to have had miraculous visions and visitations, foretelling (among other things) what penalties the King would suffer if he should divorce Catherine of Aragon. Later she was examined in Star Chamber, and in November she made a public confession. Finally she was attainted of treason and executed in the following April. The open espousal of her cause by such influential persons as Thomas More and Bishop Fisher made her discrediting and exposure an issue of some political consequence. Joye refers to her again in his *Subversion* (fol. F8^{v}) in such terms as to support the conclusion that he was writing in the latter part of the year 1533, after her public exposure:

> And as his holy mayde of kent/ whose miracles/ reuelacions/ and holy fastis be espyed and knowne to be delusions and deceitful doctrine of ye deuyl: I thinke/ for al hir fastinge and prayng aftir the popis prescript forme/ yet the deuyll will tarye in hir stil/ tyl faith in cryst purifye hir herte and so dryue him forthe.

One of the points at issue between More and Joye was the interpretation of the verse in John's Gospel (16 : 13) which says that the Spirit of Truth will lead us into all truth (*omnem veritatem* in Latin). More argued that this should be rendered "will lead you into every truth," implying that there were many truths still to be revealed that were not contained in the Scriptures; whereas Joye insisted that it should read "lead you into all truth," that is, the whole truth which Christ imparted through his Gospel. In his discussion of this point Joye's terminology retains the flavor of that scholastic logic in which he had been drilled at Cambridge. He writes (fol. B2^{v}):

> Let this terme vniuersal/ Omnis therfore stande still collectiue in his place as myche to saye as shal lede you into al trouthe comprehended & gathered togither in scripture of cryste which is ye most absolute & perfayt trouth in whom al trowthe is contayned: & playe not the sophister therwith to distribute it so confusely to lappe yn your lyes vnder ye wyde skirtis of omnis englyssing it as ye do saynge. Euery trouth.

Taken as a whole, Joye's *Subversion* is not an important work. After more than four hundred years, stale controversies are seldom inspiring reading. Nor was Joye equal to More in this sort of thrust and parry. Perhaps the most effective portion of his argument is on the topic of fasting.

Our present interest in his book centers rather on the few biographical crumbs it affords. These are found near the end of the volume when Joye is replying to More's personal remarks about him. More makes three specific charges.

The first we have already noticed in what More said in his *Confutation*, as quoted in our preceding chapter, concerning Joye's "goodly godly pystle." More alleged that in this letter Joye

> teacheth dyuerse other heresyes, but specyally that mennys vowes and promyses made of chastyte, be not lawfull nor can bynde no man in conscyence, but he may wedde when he wyll.

In reply, Joye writes thus in his *Subversion* (fol. G4):

> And as for my goodly Godly Pistle/ whiche he remembreth in his confutacion and belyeth me therto/ I knowe none syche/ excepte he meane my answere vnto the priour of Newnnahms [*sic*] goodly Godly Pistle sente vnto his reuerent Father then bisshope of Lyncolne.

More's second and third charges are contained in his *Apology* (fol. Dd4^v), where they are lumped together. One has to do with young Dick Purser, a boy who was afterward employed as a servant in More's household; and the other is a slanderous report about two nuns taken from a convent in Antwerp. In speaking of young Purser, More charges that Joye taught him heretical notions about the Sacrament. More asserts that the boy's father had already "nowseled [him] vp in suche maters" and

> had sette hym to attende vpo*n* George Iaye or Gee otherwyse called Clerke, whych is a preste, and is now for all y*t* wedded in Antwarpe/ into whose howse there, the two nonnys were brought, which Ioh*a*n Byrt otherwyse called Adryan stale [i.e., *stole*] out of theyr cloyster to make them harlottes. Thys George Iay dyd teche thys chylde hys vngracyouse heresye agaynst the blessed sacrament of the aulter/ whych heresye thys chyld afterward beynge in seruyce wyth me, began to teche another chyld in my howse, whyche vttered hys counsayle.

To these charges Joye replies as follows in his *Subversion* (fol. G3):

> Wherfore I will passe ouer and make an ende/ but firste I muste pourge

> my self with a briefe Apologye frome a cowple of lyes that More maketh of me in the hondred and xcvi leif of his longe Apologye. saynge that I taught pursers sonne attending vpon me at London .viij. or .ix. dayes/ my vngracious heresyes agenst the sacrament of the auter/ And that two nonnis were brought into my howse at Anwerpe: Whom Iohan Birte (saithe he) stale owte of their cloyster to make harlets. But the nonnes sayd playnely and yet affirme it that they came forthe leste they shulde haue bene made harletts in the cloister by a vyciouse Prieste called Syr Iohan Larke their stwerde/ whiche by theyr saynge was not mete to be a chaplayne vnto nonnis/ nor nonnes to haue siche a stwerd: and therfore came they their waye/ ... Nether came these nonnis then vnto my howse in Antwerpe I take God to recorde. And as for dicke purser/ veryly the chylde laye withe me that lytell whyle and fetched me meat/ whome I taught to saye by herte his Pater Noster/ Aue. And Credo yn Englysshe/ withe the two Prayers folowynge in the Ortulus Anime/ to say them in the morninge and euenynge/ and this/ yn good faith/ was all the Heresye that I tawght him.

Joye's mention of having stayed in London for some eight or nine days is a teaser: At what period was this? Does he refer to the few days he tarried in London while trying to see the Bishop of Lincoln before fleeing overseas to Antwerp? We know nothing of any return visit to London after he escaped thus in 1527. It is, of course, possible that he is recalling some sojourn which he made there while still a fellow of Peterhouse in Cambridge.

Neither do we know anything about John Byrt, whom we must suppose to have been an associate of the Antwerp reformers, perhaps connected with the publishing trade there. We know only that he went sometimes under the fraternal name of Adrian, presumably so that he could carry out errands for the "brethren" without having his identity disclosed.[17]

Lastly, the reference to the *Hortulus Animae* is of special interest because it betrays Joye's familiarity with its contents and because it is one of the very few specific allusions which substantiate Joye's identity as the translator of the *Hortulus* into English.[18]

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

[1] Quoted from Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, 1563 ed., p. 521; see also Pratt's ed. V, 131. "Barrowe" was the English form of Bergen-op-Zoom; and "N." is conjectured to stand for Henry Norris, one of Anne's supporters at the court.

[2] Unless they are to be identified with the lost fragment once in the possession of Humphrey Wanley, who described it as a part of a printed Bible older than Coverdale's. (On this topic see Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations* ..., p. 79 ff.)

[3] See particularly Dr Mozley's contributions to *Notes and Queries*, CLXXXIII, 305, and CLXXXV, 87. Joye's claim to the authorship of this work has recently been re-asserted by W. D. J. Cargill Thompson, "Who wrote *The Supper of the Lord?*", *Harvard Theological Review*, LIII (1960), 77-91. This article appeared too late for a consideration of its argument in the present work.

[4] Bale was perhaps influenced by Bonner's list of forbidden books (1542); see below, p. 247-248.

[5] See A. G. Chester, *Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English*, pp. 81-89, 94.

[6] Reference: S.P. 1/75; fol. 210. The transcript given above was made by Miss Sylvia L. England and checked by Dr Mozley. An abstract is given in *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, Vol. VI, No. 402. See also Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 26.

[7] See his *William Tyndale*, p. 272.

[8] See Joye's *Apology* (Arber's reprint, pp. 6 and 14). The particular passages of Scripture that Joye had in mind in his letter to Latimer were doubtless Mark 12 : 18-27; II Cor. 5 : 1; Philip. 1 : 21-23; John 5 : 24; Acts 23 : 8.

[9] Later, in his *Apology* (Arber's reprint, p. 32), Joye refers to this person as "the yonge man." His identity is quite unknown to us, but he was evidently known to Frith. Anyone then in his thirties would have seemed a young man to Joye.

[10] See above, p. 65. See also Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 24.

[11] Foxe (ed. Pratt, VIII, 595) attributes this renewed activity to a sermon preached by Thomas Curwen, one of Henry's chaplains, in the Lenten season; but this seems too early, for Cranmer's letter telling about Frith is dated June 17. On the other hand, Anderson's conjecture (*Annals of the English Bible*, 1845 ed., I, 368) that Curwen's sermon was delivered on May 8, 1533, as recorded in a late edition of Stow's *Annals* (*S.T.C.* 23340), falls to the ground on two counts: (1) May 8 was not a Sunday, and (2) Peto's sermon, to which Curwen delivered his rejoinder the following week, was preached on March 31, 1532 (see *State Papers, Spanish*, Vol. IV, Pt. 2, No. 934.)

[12] Clement's tentative sentence against Henry can be read in N. Pocock, *Records of the Reformation*, II, 677. According to A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII* (p. 242) a formal bull of excommunication was drawn up by Paul III, dated August 30,

1535, but was not actually delivered till December 1538. See also Burnet's *History of the Reformation* (ed. Pocock), IV, 318.

[13] The date of the letter was changed to August 3, but the alteration is perhaps in another hand, and the letter itself points to a date some four days later. The letter is printed in *State Papers*, VII, 489.

[14] The letter is printed in full in *State Papers ... of the Reign of King Henry VIII*, VII, 516.

[15] A complete copy is in the Bodleian Library and an imperfect one in the Cambridge University Library. For further discussion of this little work (*S.T.C.* 21318) see Butterworth, "The *Mystik sweet Rosary* of 1533", [*University of Pennsylvania*] *Library Chronicle* (1955) XXI, 91.

[16] The book (*S.T.C.* 14829) has 64 leaves (A-H^8). The colophon reads: "M.D. xxxiiij. at Emdon by Iacob Aurik." It is described in Nijhoff and Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliographie*, Vol. II, No. 3282.

[17] More refers to him in his *Confutation* (fol. CC1^v) as "Iohan Byrte otherwyse callynge hym selfe Adryane, otherwyse Iohan bokebynder, & yet otherwyse now I can not tell you what." Tyndale also refers to him in his second letter to John Frith: "If, when you have read this, you may send it to Adrian, do, I pray you, that he may know how that our heart is with you" (Foxe, V, 133). From this we gather that Byrt was in England when Tyndale wrote his letter.

[18] See also Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 35.

7

Other Translations from the Old Testament

THE year 1534 was momentous in the history of England and of the English Church. Henry had determined to renounce, once and for all, any semblance of papal authority in England. To this design the Parliament that reassembled at Westminster on January 25, 1534, was acquiescent. By the time it was prorogued on March 30 it had given legal force to the King's will in several pieces of legislation which were to prove of far-reaching significance.

As had been foreseen, Pope Clement on March 23 at last published his decree in favor of Catherine of Aragon, declaring her to be still the rightful queen and her divorce to have been unwarranted and of no effect. Within a week, even before the official notification of the Pope's action had been received in England, Parliament responded by passing the Act of Succession, declaring Anne Boleyn the rightful queen and vesting the succession to the throne in the King's offspring by her. Furthermore, the Act required of all subjects an oath of allegiance in support of its provisions. This involved an acknowledgment, of course, that the divorce of Catherine was legal and valid. Finally, on March 31, Convocation likewise went on record with its declaration that the Pope as Bishop of Rome had no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop.

Those who held to the old allegiance were thus made liable to the charge of treason. The most prominent of these were Sir Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher, both of whom stood by their old convictions and consequently were imprisoned in the Tower on April 13 for refusing to subscribe to the new oath.

To the reformers in Antwerp these events seemed the inauguration of a new era. Their zeal ran ahead to the hopeful conclusion that the reformed doctrines would now be widely accepted in England and the Scriptures be allowed to circulate in the mother tongue. But Henry's first thought was evidently only to be master in his own realm. Though insisting on his right to be regarded as head of the English Church, he showed no intention of abandoning the theology of Catholicism. In November, before the year was out, Parliament legally confirmed his title as "supreme head in earth of the Church of England."

JEREMY THE PROPHET

Joye lost no time in making the most of these developments. In May 1534 he translated and published his version of Jeremiah, spreading on its title page not only his own name and dignity but also a timely note of exultation:

> Ieremy the Prophete/ translated into Englisshe: by George Ioye: some tyme felowe of Peter College in Camebridge.
>
> ¶The songe of Moses is added in the ende to magnif ye [*sic*] our Lorde for the fall of our Pharao the Bisshop of Rome.
>
> ¶Anno. M.D. and .xxxiiii. in the monethe of Maye.

The book is not so handsomely printed as was Joye's Isaiah; the printing is ascribed to the press of the widow of Christopher Van Endhoven, but there is no colophon. Only two copies are known to be preserved, at the British Museum and the Cambridge University Library.[1]

As he had done before, in an endeavor to ground his translation on the Hebrew text rather than the Vulgate, Joye turned once more to the work of Zwingli, who had published a Latin version of Jeremiah in 1531, the year of his death.[2]

Joye's preface to *Jeremy the Prophet* is among the most effective of his efforts. It commences:

> The Prophetes/ as they were al taught/ stered [i.e., *stirred*] vp/ and thrusted forth of one spirit to preche and wryte the worde of the Lorde: so folowd they al one threde and lyne tending vnto one ende/ euen our sauiour Iesus Christe the parfait some & ful conclusion of al the lawe & Prophetes. So that whoso in reding the lawe & Prophets/ directe his inwarde eye to beholde & knowe our heuenly father for *ye* one very God a lone with his sone Iesus Cryste sent vs from him/ beleuinge perfitly to be iustifyed and saued by the grace of God *ye* father through *ye* merits onely of Cristis dethe very God & man/ he readeth a right with grete frute/ he recheth & resteth graciously vpon the same marke that al the Prophets did shote at/ eue*n* vpon him that sayd. I am the waie/ the trouthe/ and lyfe.

Joye compares the turmoil and resistance of his own day with the troubles that Jeremiah had with his backsliding people. He cites the prophet's words (2 : 13) that the people not only forsook the Lord but "digged themself vp pittis al to troden and broken whiche maye holde no waters." Further on (fol. A5), when he alludes to the fact that Jeremiah is now available in English, he does not of course spare "the bisshop of Rome":

> Wherfore now at laste/ it hathe pleased almighty God to call forthe Ieremy his Prophete/ to sende & to sette him as a brason wall & piller of yerne [i.e., *iron*] to preche in englisshe agenst this heuy monster of Rome & al his draffe.

Thinking of the "pittis al to troden and broken," Joye calls the adherents of Rome "dirty deluers."

Toward the end of his preface Joye turns again to the troubles that beset Jeremiah and, recalling the heroism of the prophet, he breaks out into a fine sequence of balanced clauses, not at all typical of his usual style. For this passage (fol. A6) he is indebted to the dedicatory epistle of Zwingli;[3] nevertheless Joye brings it off in very good style:

> For he exhorted them swetely and louingly/ he rebuked sharply and ernestly/ & preched euermore as faithfully & constantly. So that if we beholde his faithfullnes/ he is ferue*n*t. If we consyder his erudicion and doctrine/ he

> shyneth. If we loke vpon his prudence/ it is right sauourye & well ceasoned. If we beholde his godlynes/ he excedeth. And as for his constancye/ it is inuincible & bereth a waye al ye victory.

Lastly, he refers again to the English translation:

> Whom lo/ now (Christen reder) thou hast in thy handes preching vnto the in Englisshe the same sermons whiche he preched vnto the peple of Iuda & Ierusalem.

Joye was able to indulge himself in the luxury of a few marginal notes in his Jeremiah. While most of these are explanatory, in a couple of them his unruly zeal finds a convenient vent. For instance, in the fiftieth chapter (verse 23) where his translation reads, "How is this grete hammer of al the worlde/ thus now broken alto peses?" he remarks in the margin: "Rome hath knocked vs a ful long tyme." And farther on (verse 35) his version reads:

> The swerde vpon ye Caldes saith the Lorde/ and vpon the inhabitours of Babylon/ vpon hir rulers/ and vpon hir wyse men/ the swerde vpon hir soithe sayers/ & they shalbe made foles.

Whereupon Joye slyly asks in the margin: "The grete wyse writer of their vnwriten verites/ wher is he now become?" This was a quick and sweet revenge on the "unwritten verities" of Sir Thomas More, who had just the month before been imprisoned in the Tower.

As for Joye's English version of the prophet, it shows the same earmarks that we have noted in his other translations: a freehanded and rather hasty rendition, yet not unfaithful to his source, with occasional happy hits that establish themselves even down to the Authorized Version; and, on the other hand, strange and transient colloquial turns of speech that impart a certain naïveté and colorful effect.[4]

One of Joye's intriguing contributions in his Jeremiah was the use (apparently he invented it) of the term *backslider*, which he varies with the related term *backfaller*. The latter word was never taken into general use, but *backslide* has a curious history. Joye uses both words especially in the third chapter;[5] a typical verse is 3 : 22, which Joye renders: "Be conuerted you baksliden childern/ and I shal heale your bakslydinges."

Coverdale, in his Bible of 1535, did not relish the word and used it only once in his version of Jeremiah (3 : 11), where, following Joye's lead, he has "The bacslyder is more rightuous, the*n* the vnfaithfull Iuda." But verse 22 he renders: "O ye shrenkinge children, turne agayne, ... And so shal I heale youre bacturnynges." Furthermore Coverdale eschewed the word in his Great Bible, substituting for it a broader array of synonyms.[6] Neither was it used by the Geneva Bible, nor the Bishops', nor the Douay Old Testament. But someone among the King James translators took a fancy to the word and the Authorized Version restores Joye's word in practically every case. It is even preferred in one place (8 : 5) where Joye had not used it: "slidden backe, by a perpetual backesliding." In his rendering of this verse Joye employed another of his favorite words, *stiffly*: "How is it than that this peple and Ierusalem be auerted so steifly for euer?"

Joye's utilization of his source and his dependence on Zwingli's Latin version can be briefly and sufficiently illustrated from the third verse of Chapter 31. Here Zwingli's *Complanatio* read:

> Sic & nunc de longinquo sese manifestabit mihi Dominus, & dicet: Ego te perpetuo amore prosequor, ideo misericordiam oppando tibi.

This Joye rendered as follows:

> And eue*n* so now shal the Lorde shew himselfe vnto me beinge in farre partes sayng. I loue the with a perpetual loue: wherfore I spread my mercy ouer the.

For an example of his characteristic renderings we have the verse about the Ethiopian changing his skin and the leopard his spots (13 : 23), which Joye renders:

> For euen as the Morin may change his skinne & the Leoparde his spottes/ so maye you once accustomed & stayned with synne do good.

The form "Morin" Joye may have adapted from Luther's "Mohr"; Zwingli's Latin had "Aethiops."[7] Again, where Jeremiah, speaking of the man who puts his trust in man rather than in God, compares him to "the heath in the desert" (17 : 6), Joye gives us this:

> For he shalbe lyke the fearne that groweth in the deserte/neuer to se the goodnes to come/ but shal abyde vpon the drye deserte/ euen the salte barayn grownde inhabitable [*sic*].

This last word, intended for the negative of "habitable" is taken over from Zwingli—"salsuginosam et inhabitabilem." The verse illustrates Joye's tendency to expatiate; and farther on in the same chapter (17 : 12) this weakness runs to verboseness, perhaps the more noticeable because the reading in the King James Bible is so full of inspiration. The latter says simply, "A glorious high throne from the beginning, *is* the place of our Sanctuarie." Joye spins this out to thinness, thus:

> But thou Lorde/ whose seate is moste noblest/ highest and aunciaunt [i.e., *ancient*]: which dwellest in the place of our holy reste/ ...

Ordinarily one would expect Coverdale to do better; but here he seems plainly to be influenced by Joye's version, for he writes:

> But thou (o Lorde) whose trone is most glorious, excellent and of most antiquite, which dwellest in the place of oure holy rest: ...

This raises anew the question of how great was Coverdale's debt to Joye when he came to prepare his Bible in the following year. A careful comparison of these two versions of Jeremiah side by side—Joye's and Coverdale's—in a number of passages leads one to the conclusion that Coverdale was thoroughly familiar with Joye's work and may possibly have had it in front of him. But of course he did not copy it nor try to imitate it; rather he sought to improve upon it, and usually he succeeded. His literary tact was much sounder than Joye's. He seems to use Joye's wording as a point of departure and does in fact constantly depart from him; yet the places where the two agree are so frequent, so natural and unobtrusive, and yet so specific, they can hardly be coincidental.

Nevertheless, this whole question of indebtedness is further complicated by the fact that Coverdale's primary dependence was not on Joye but rather on the Swiss-German version of the Bible which had been published by the preachers of Zurich of whom Zwingli was one. Dr Mozley, carrying forward the investigations of Westcott and Eadie, has pointed out that Coverdale in his translation seems to have been especially partial to the Zurich Bible of 1534.[8] It does not appear that Joye used the Swiss-German version, but Zwingli's Latin (which he did use) was undoubtedly influenced by the vernacular version that Zwingli himself had helped to prepare.

Since this whole question is of some importance, the reader is asked to consider the following parallels. These are chosen not because they are startling in their similarity but rather because they are so typical and casual in their points of agreement. In Jeremiah 31 : 3 (cited above from Joye's version) Coverdale's reads:

> Euen so shal the Lorde now also apeare vnto me from farre, and saye: I loue the with an euerlastinge loue, therfore do I sprede my mercy before the.

It is to be remarked that neither Luther nor the Vulgate supplied the figure of spreading mercy; but the Zurich Bible had it and so did Zwingli's Latin (as we have noted above).

Further on in this same chapter (verses 7 and 8) Joye writes:

> The Lorde will delyuer and saue his peple/ euen the remnaunt of Israel. Lo/ I shal bringe them agen from the northe regions/ and gather them togither from the costis of the erth/ with the blynd and lame which ar amonge them/ with wemen great with childe/ and with them also that now be delyuered.

Coverdale renders the passage thus:

> The Lorde shall delyuer his people, the remnaunt of Israel, & make them

> whole. Beholde, I will bringe them agayne from out of the north lo*n*de, and gather them from the endes of the worlde, with the blynde and lame that are amonge them, with the women that be greate with childe, and soch as be also delyuered: ...

Note here the phrase "with the blynde and lame that are amonge them"; note also that such changes as are made evince a desire to improve the literary quality of the translation: "northe regions" becomes "north lo*n*de"; "weme*n* great with childe" becomes "women that be greate with childe"; and so on.

In the eighth chapter there are a number of interesting parallels. Most spectacular is Joye's use of the word *treacle* at the end of the chapter (verse 22) which Coverdale retains. This picturesque word has led some writers to affix the name Treacle Bible to certain English versions from Coverdale to the Bishop's Bible, but these amiable historians have been unaware that Joye first introduced the word in this passage:

> Is there no rosyne medicinable or triakle lefte in Galaad? There is no phisicion there that maye restore the daughter of my peple to hir helthe.

Coverdale, following in the footsteps of the Zurich Bible, has wisely simplified the translation:

> ... for there is no more Triacle at Galaad, and there is no Phisician, that ca*n* heale the hurte of my people.

Earlier in the same chapter (verses 10–12) Joye had written:

> ... for fro*m* the leste to the gretest al gape for fylthye lucre. Frome prophete to preest al ar lyers. But in the mean ceason they heal the breache & affliccion of my peple powdering it with this lye sayng: There shal be peace/ there shalbe peace/ whan there is none at all. Fygh for shame/ they committe abominable and shameful dedes & ar past al shame.

In the Coverdale Bible this passage reads:

> For from the lowest vnto the hyest, they folowe all shamefull lucre: and

> from the prophet vnto the prest, they deale all with lies. Neuertheles, they heale the hurte of my people with swete wordes, sayenge: peace, peace, where there is no peace at all. Fye for shame, how abhominable thinges do they? And yet they be not ashamed, yee they knowe of no shame.

Notice here the word "lucre" (the phrase "filthy lucre" was Tyndale's in his New Testament); notice the expression "no peace at all"; and notice in particular the rendering "Fye for shame": for here Joye and Coverdale were on common ground in their liking for homely phrases. Yet it is to be noted that what was suggested by the Zurich Bible in its rendition was not far off: "Pfuch der schand/ wie scheützliche greuwliche ding thand sy."

Lastly, in the same eighth chapter (verses 14 and 15) we have this parallel. Joye translates thus:

> For our Lorde God hath put vs to sylence and geuen vs to drynke water mengled with gall because we synned agenst him. We loked for peace/ but there came no good: we taryed and waited for the tyme of helthe/ but lo/ al is syknes and trowble.

Coverdale is closer than usual to Joye in this passage:

> For the Lorde oure God hath put vs to sylence, and geuen vs water myxte with gall, to drynke, because we haue synned agaynst him. We loked for peace, and we fare not the better, we wayted for the tyme of health, and lo, here is nothinge but trouble.

Such, then, are the bits of evidence, which could be multiplied many times, to show some sort of interrelationship between Joye's *Jeremy the Prophet* and the Coverdale Bible—a relationship that is complicated by the collateral influence of the Zurich Bible.

In this same publication Joye also included his version of the Lamentations of Jeremiah. He was aware of the acrostic construction of the first four chapters of this book and alludes to it in an introductory paragraph: "Euery verse hauinge before it orderly an Hebrew letter aftir their .A.B.C."

One short specimen of this portion of his work will suffice. Each of the three verses (Lam. 3 : 24-26) begins with the Hebrew letter *Teth*, which Joye inserts:

> Teth. The Lorde is good vnto y*e* faste beleuinge soule y*t* seketh & asketh aftir him. Teth. It is good paciently to suffer/ and softely to waite for that sauing helth from the Lorde. Teth. Oh how goodly a thing is it for a man to take and beare the yoke euen from his yougthe.

The Lamentations yield their quota of typical Joyesque renderings, of which we will cite here only one (1 : 20):

> Beholde Lorde/ for I am scourged/ my bely rombleth/ my hert wambleth in me/ and I am withoute forthe ful of bitternes/ the swerde maketh me a wydewe/ with in I am lyke dethe.

Here the dialect word "wamble" means to reel or to quiver; while the obsolete expression "without forth" goes back to the time of Wycliffe, though no connection with the great reformer's work is implied.

Finally, in order to fill out the pages of the concluding signature (or as Joye puts it, "to supply the leaf") he gives us his version of the Song of Moses (Exodus 15 : 1-18). This was mentioned on the title page, but Joye's enthusiasm over the recent events impels him to provide an additional note of introduction, so that no one will miss the connection. This reads in part (fol. P6^{v}):

> ¶To supplee the lefe/ take here (Cryste*n* reder) that goodly and godly songe of Moses. Where w*t* [i.e., *where with*] thou oughtest now gloriously to magnifie & prayse God for the destruccion and throing downe of our cruel Pharao the Bisshop of Rome. ...

Joye's version of this brief addendum is not without interest; for Tyndale had of course provided a translation of the Song of Moses in his Pentateuch. But Joye does not restrict himself to Tyndale's version, although he makes use of it. Indeed, he treats it much as Coverdale was to treat Joye's version of Jeremiah: he uses it as a point of departure. An illustration will make this clear (Exodus 15 : 4-8); here is Joye's version:

> His iolye [i.e., *jolly*] chosen captayns ar drowned in the redde sea/ the depe waters haue ouerwhelmed the*m*/ they sanke downe vnto the botome lyke stones. Thy ryghtha*n*de oh Lorde is grete & gloriouse in strength: Thy right hande Lorde hathe thrusted downe the enemye. To thy grete glory haste thou destroyed thyne aduersaryes: thou sentst forthe thy wrathe/ & it consumed them lyke stobble. With the brethe of thyne anger y*e* waters ra*n*ne togither on heapis: so that y*e* bare botome was sene/ the flowing flowd [i.e., *flood*] stode vp as faste as a rocke. And the boto*m*les water was congeled in the myddis of the sea.

Tyndale's version no doubt supplied certain elements of this phraseology; for example, Tyndale wrote: "His iolye captaynes are drowned in the red see, the depe waters haue couered them: thei soncke to the botome as a stone ... thou hast destroyed thine aduersaries, thou sentest forth thy wrath a*n*d it consumed them: eue*n* as stobell. With the breth off thine anger the water gathered together ... a*n*d the depe water congeled together in the myddest of the see." As to why Joye departed so lightly from Tyndale's version of this Song of Moses, he leaves us no clue, except perhaps his general contention (expressed in his letter to Latimer) that profit could ensue from "diversity of translations." Incidentally, Coverdale also strikes out for himself in his version of the Song of Moses, giving us this rather delightful rendering of the final clause cited above: "The depes plomped together in y*e* myddest of the see." It is instructive to see Coverdale's picturesque word "plomped" suggested to him in the pages of the Zurich Bible (Exodus 15 : 8): "Die tieffe plumptend in einander mitten im Meer."

THE PSALTER OF 1534

The summer of 1534 brought much encouragement to the reformers and the promoters of English Scripture in Antwerp. For about this time it became clear to certain publishers in London that no penalties would now be exacted for the publication of vernacular Scripture in the homeland. The first of the London printers to venture on this new and promising market seems to have been John Byddell, who brought forth an English Primer based largely on the *Hortulus Animae* that Joye had published in Antwerp four years before. It was sponsored by William Marshall, who added certain materials of Lutheran extraction and called the book *A Prymer in Englyshe* (S.T.C. 15986).[9] The publication of this volume marked the beginning of seven plenteous years of English Scripture.

In Antwerp itself there were also encouraging signs. The new but ill-fated Queen, Anne Boleyn, was then near the summit of her influence, and this she exerted generally in behalf of the reformers. At any rate, in the middle of May she undertook to befriend one of the English merchants at Antwerp who had formerly been persecuted for his part in circulating the English New Testaments. This was Richard Harman (or Herman), who was restored to his full rights and privileges as a member of the English merchants resident in Antwerp through the intercession of a letter in his behalf written by Queen Anne to Thomas Cromwell, who had recently been made Secretary of State. Later in the summer, Stephen Vaughan was appointed as head of the English merchants at Antwerp, and this too was a gesture friendly to the reformers.

Publishers in the neighborhood of Antwerp were not unmindful of the opportunities that were opening up as a result of these developments. In the course of this summer of 1534 they brought forth a couple of unauthorized reprints of the Tyndale Testament of 1526; but this is a subject that we are to deal with in the next chapter.

Meanwhile both Tyndale and Joye felt that the time was ripe for fresh undertakings. Tyndale brought out a revised edition of his version of the book of Genesis: "Newly correctyd and amendyd by w.T." Joye turned his attention again to the book of Psalms, and in the month of August brought out a new translation of the Psalter.

Why Joye was impelled to do another version of the Psalms instead of enlarging his territory by a translation of Job or some of the later prophets we are not told. One fact that may have influenced him was that Zwingli, before his death, had compiled a Latin version of the Psalms which was published posthumously in 1532 under the title *Enchiridion Psalmorum*, and Joye may have felt that this version was superior to that of Bucer, which he had translated four years before. At any rate, his new translation was based on Zwingli,[10] and was entitled:

> Dauids Psalter/ diligently and faithfully tra*n*slated by George Ioye/ with breif Arguments before euery Psalme/ declaringe the effecte therof.

The title page also bears the following quotation from Psalm 120, though we are left to surmise about its intended application: "Lorde/ delyuer me from lyinge lippes a*n*d from a deceaitful tonge."

The new Psalter was a small thick volume of 224 numbered leaves, printed by Marten de Keyser.[11] The type is neat and clear but somewhat crowded on the page. It may be suspected that the edition was not large; at any rate only one known copy survives today, that in Cambridge University Library. At the end of the book there is a table of Psalms in alphabetical order, and at the close of the last Psalm we are told:

> Thus endeth the text of the Psalmes/ translated oute of Latyne by George Ioye. The yere of our lorde M.D.xxxiiii. y*e* moneth of Auguste.

Unlike other of Joye's works, the book contains no other notes or prefaces, and the preliminary "arguments" before each Psalm are short and perfunctory.

The work would seem to bear the marks of haste. One is surprised to find that the last of the Psalms is numbered 151! But this was due to a confusion between the Hebrew and the Latin numeration of the Psalms.[12] Joye evidently intended to employ the Hebrew numbering, but Zwingli's Latin version followed the Latin sequence, although it also bore notations of the Hebrew numeration. But when Joye came to Psalm 147 (which was 146 in the Zwingli text) he inadvertently followed Zwingli in subdividing this Psalm, as the Latin Psalters do, so that in Joye's version verses 12-20 got themselves labeled Psalm 148. But there were still three Psalms to come; so we are calmly presented with Psalm 151!

Joye's Psalter of 1534, as might be expected, is replete with echoes from the earlier version of 1530, yet it is not in any sense a mere revision of that edition but rather a complete new translation. Though he seems to have held in memory many characteristic turns of speech from the earlier Psalter, he departs from it frequently and radically.

Of the kinship between the two, a few examples will suffice. In the first Psalm (see above, p. 57), where the 1530 edition spoke of "the seate of *ye* pestelent scorners," the new version lays it on still thicker: "sitteth not downe in the chaier with the peruerse pestelent skorners." And in the twenty-third Psalm, verse 2, the very unusual word "retch" in the sense of "lead," which the earlier version had used (see above, p. 58), is repeated again in the 1534 edition: "and retcheth me forthe vnto swete still runninge waters." Another interesting parallel is found in Psalm 90, verse 9. Here the 1530 Psalter reads: "All owre dayes (thou being Angre) shall slyde awaye: owre yeares go awaye lyke a thoughte"; and now in the 1534 Psalter this reads: "Thou beinge angre/ al our dayes are slyden awaye: our years ar gone in a thought."

Did Joye actually have his earlier version before him? A passage such as the following (Ps. 119 : 92, 93) would indicate that perhaps he did. In 1530 it read:

> Except thy lawe had bene my delight: I had p*er*yshed in my afflicci*on*. I shall never therfore forget thy commaundementes: for by the*m* thou hast refresshed me.

In 1534 this reads:

> Except thy lawe had bene my counfort/ I had nowe perisshed in my affliccion. I shal therfore neuer forget thi co*m*maundments/ for with the*m* thou refresshest me.

On the other hand, there are many places where the two versions are entirely disparate and seemingly unrelated. Take for example verse 4 of Psalm 93: the wordings, though somewhat turgid in both versions, perhaps to match the raging of the waters, show little similarity. In the 1530 Psalter we have:

> Above the noyse of the mervelous stormy and troubled see: mervelous is the lorde which hath his resydence above.

In 1534 this reads:

> But yet myghtyer is the lorde that dwelleth on highe: then the sowne of the maigne sea and streames of water/ be thei neuer so vehement.

Another example may be cited from the closing verses of Psalm 67, where the influence of Zwingli is apparent. The earlier version had read:

> The erthe also mought give ageine hyr encrease: and god which is ower god mought do vs good. God mought blesse vs: and all that inhabit the erthe evene vnto the vttermoste partes therof mought feare hym.

In the new Psalter this read:

> God which is oure god be benigne and liberal vnto vs/ that the erthe mought geue forth her yerely frutes with encrease. God be benigne and graciouse vnto vs/ that al the coostis of the erthe mought feare him.

Joye was often partial to the obsolete form "mought"; but it was Zwingli who supplied him with the ideas of "benign" and "yearly." For Zwingli's Latin in this passage read: "Benignus sit nobis Deus Deus noster, ut terra det annonam suam." The repetition of "encrease" is probably an echo from the 1530 Psalter.

Of special interest is the picturesque passage in Psalm 102 (verses 6 and 7). Here the 1530 edition, based on Bucer and using quaint old terms of speech, had read:

> I am lyke an oestrege [i.e., *ostrich*] of the wyldernes: and made lyke an houlet [i.e., *owlet*] in an olde forlaten [i.e., *forsaken*] house. I lye wakinge and am lefte alone: lyke the sparowe in the thacke [i.e., *thatch*].

The rendering in 1534 is a little more elaborate:

> I am lyke ye pellycane [i.e., *pelican*] in ye wyldernes/ and lyke the night fowle in ye olde broken celinges. I wake and am lyke ye lytel sparowe which sitteth solytary without his mate in ye rofe of ye house.

In this passage Zwingli's hand can be traced again. For Zwingli, following the lead of the Vulgate, introduces the "pelican" (*pelecano in solitudine*), and the form of his "owl among the rubble" (*noctua in ruderibus*) suggests a night-bird; moreover, his "little sparrow" is described as a "widow" (*passerculo qui viduus in tecto sedet.*)

Now Zwingli's *Enchiridion Psalmorum* gave not only his Latin version of the Hebrew text but also a colloquial Swiss-German version in parallel columns. Zwingli's German in many points resembles the version which the Zurich preachers gave in their Swiss-German Bible, but is by no means identical with it.[13] Joye seems to have been satisfied with Zwingli's Latin. But Coverdale, when he came to make his Bible in 1535, was influenced again by the Zurich Bible. He even observed the use of capital letters for the birds, and wrote:

> I am become like a Pellicane in the wildernes, and like an Oule in a broken wall. I wake, and am euen as it were a sparow sittinge alone vpon the house toppe.[14]

Once again the question arises, Did Coverdale make use of the Joye Psalters? Again the evidence indicates that he did. Reference has already been made to the unusual word "bugges" in Psalm 91 and to "shepehoke" in Psalm 23 (see above, p. 59); and both of these are retained in the 1534 Psalter. Of Coverdale's specific dependence on this latter Psalter the evidence, though not overwhelming, is fairly convincing. Consider, for instance, these two verses (1 and 5) from Psalm 27. In the Psalter of 1534 they read:

> The Lorde is my light & my helthe: whom then shal I feare? the lorde is the strength of my lyfe/ of whom then shal I be afrayde? ... For he hath hyd me in a perellouse tyme/ he dyd hyde me in the secrete place of his tabernacle/ & lifted me vp into a rocke of stonne.

The Coverdale Bible reads quite similarly:

> The Lorde is my light and my health: whom then shulde I feare? the Lorde is the strength of my life, for whom then shulde I be afrayed? ... For in the tyme of trouble he hath hyd me in his tabernacle, yee in the secrete place of his dwellinge hath he kepte and set me vp vpon a rocke of stone.

Or take this verse near the close of Psalm 130, where Joye's Psalter reads:

> Let Israel truste vnto the Lorde/ for with the Lorde is ther bothe infinite mercy and plentuouse redempcion.

And Coverdale has:

> Let Israel trust in the Lorde, for with the Lorde there is mercy and plenteous redempcion.

Moreover, in both these instances, there is nothing in the Zurich Bible to influence Coverdale in the choice of such salient phrases as "rocke of stone" or "plenteous redempcion."[15]

Occasionally this Psalter of 1534 scores a hit in anticipating the phraseology of the Authorized Version. For example, the word "desolations" occurs in Psalm 46 : 8, where Joye's reading is:

> Come and se the workis of the lorde/ what desolacions he hath made vpon the erth.

Only Joye's 1534 Psalter, in this period, makes use of this effective word, though later it was taken over by the Geneva Psalter. Moreover, it is Joye's own word: he does not owe it to the Vulgate nor to Zwingli's Latin (*quasnam solitudines*). Or take the pleasing phrase, "vnto their desired hauen," in Psalm 107 : 30. Here, according to the beautiful rendering in the King James Bible, those "that goe downe to the sea in shippes," after being tossed and beaten with storms, find the waves subsiding: "Then are they glad, because they be quiet: so he bringeth them vnto their desired hauen." Only in Joye's Psalter of 1534 do we come upon this particular phrase: "and eftesone he bringeth them vnto their desyred hauen."

Yet, as in other of Joye's works, his new Psalter was often marred by the curious and the gauche. For example, who would not be grateful to Coverdale and his successors for ignoring Joye's rendition of the beginning of the second Psalm:

> Se how the gentils grinne? se how the people enforce al in vaine.
> The kynges of the worlde runne togither: and the cheiftens swarme on heapis agenst the lorde and his anoynted.

We have remarked that this Psalter shows signs of haste, and of course it was soon to be superseded by the version in the Coverdale Bible. Yet for a couple of years it did enjoy a kind of vogue. This is borne out by the fact that it was known in London by the early part of 1535. For when the bars were let down against the publication of English Scripture, a London printer, Robert Redman, brought out two books in the beginning of 1535, a book of Bible prayers and a Primer. The former, *Prayers of the Byble,*[16] contained a section comprising thirty-eight different Psalms, and it must have been flattering to Joye (unless he resented it) to learn that Redman's editor copied these from Joye's 1534 Psalter, presumably as the latest version available in English. Redman's other book was a Latin-English edition of the Primer according to the use of Sarum—the first of its kind to be printed—and here again, of the fifty-eight different Psalms it included, some forty or more were based on Joye's new version, though sometimes with slight modifications. Indeed, one Psalm—the one hundred and thirtieth—persisted in Joye's version through subsequent editions of the Primer down to 1539. It commenced in Joye's typical vein: "Owte of the botomlesse pitte of my heuy trouble I call vnto the/ oh Lorde."

Incidentally, Redman's Primer also turned to Joye for its rendering of the prayer of Hezekiah which occurs in the Dirge and which was copied from Joye's *Prophet Isaiah*. Thus it appears that in the early part of 1535 the translations of Joye were beginning to find some favorable acceptance in his native land.

PROVERBS AND ECCLESIASTES

This is a convenient and suitable place to bring together what is known about the most obscure of all of Joye's translations, namely, his version of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.

Writing in his *Apology* in February 1535 (fol. C4^{v}) and speaking of the preceding summer, Joye says:

> ... for now was ther geue*n* tha*n*ked be god a lytel space to breath & reste vnto christis chirche aftir so lo*n*ge and greuouse persecucion for reading the bokes.

We have already seen that in England John Byddell and Robert Redman took advantage of this period of release to put forth books containing English Scripture. There was yet a third printer in London who entered this same field. This was Thomas Godfray, a venturesome publisher who seldom dated his imprints. Two of the books he now brought forth were tied in with the published works of George Joye. One was a reprint of the Psalter of 1530 (see above, p. 55) with the title copied at length but with no identification, as to authorship, either with "Iohan Aleph" or with Joye. The other was an English Primer based on Joye's *Hortulus Animae*, with some additional materials from other sources.[17]

Now it was this same printer, Godfray, who published the only extant copy that is known of Joye's version of the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.[18] The title pages disclose nothing as to authorship. That of Proverbs reads: "¶ The pr*o*uerbes of Solomon/ newly translated into Englyshe"; that of Ecclesiastes: "¶ Here foloweth the boke of Solomo*n* called Ecclesiastes/ (which is to say in Englishe a precher)." Though they are now separately bound as two thin little volumes, the style of the latter title indicates that originally they were issued as two portions of one volume, even though each had its own register of foliation.[19]

The colophons also are disappointing in what information they divulge. The first simply has "Printed at London by Thomas Godfray";

the second is slightly more formal, as befits the end of a volume: "¶ Imprynted at London by Tho. Godfray. ¶ Cum priuilegio."

The two problems of authorship and date are next to be considered. There is no question whatever that these particular translations are the work of Joye. The style of his phraseology confirms this, as we shall see. Historically, there are only two records extant which state that Joye made a translation of these books. One is the listing of his works in Bale's *Summarium* (1548) where, along with Joye's other biblical translations, these two items appear (fol. 239^v): "Prouerbia Salomonis, li. l; Ecclesiasten eiusdem, li. l"; in which the "li. l" stands for "one book." The other record has been unearthed by Dr Mozley, who found that in the list which Bishop Bonner made of books publicly burned on September 26, 1546, there is one entry which is unaccountably omitted by Foxe from his *Acts and Monuments*, namely the fourth book in the section given to Joye's works: "Item the proverbes of Salamon translated into Englyshe."[20] These are apparently the only contemporary references to these translations. Nothing further is heard of them until Henry Cotton, in 1852, published the second edition of his catalogue of Bibles in which he inserted (p. 4) the following footnote:

> Bale affirms, in his *Illustres Britanniae Scriptores* (p. 239, edit. 1548), that in addition to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Psalms ... Joye translated into English the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. I have not ascertained whether either of these last were printed, or whether they are yet existing any where in manuscript.

There the matter stood until the present writer, in his *Literary Lineage of the King James Bible* (1941, p. 88), attributed the two little volumes then in the Harmsworth library to Joye.

The question of date is full of perplexity: When did Godfray publish these two little volumes? Had there been an earlier edition of them than his? In the first place, when we look at the colophons of Godfray's other books—the Psalter and the Primer—we note that each one lays claim to the royal "privilege." The colophon in the Psalter reads: "Printed at London by Thomas Godfray. Cum priuilegio Regali. Praise ye the lorde. Amen." That in the Primer has it: "Printed at London by Thomas Godfray. Cum priuilegio Rygali." We notice also that in the almanac of the Primer the table of Easter dates begins with the year 1535, suggesting, though by no means conclusively, that Godfray's Primer was published in the first half of that year.

We have already observed that the colophon at the end of Godfray's Ecclesiastes concludes with the words "Cum priuilegio." Now it is almost unthinkable that any printer in London should have dared to print a volume of Scripture in the English tongue, especially if fortified by the royal "privilege," prior to the break with Rome in the spring of 1534. The assumption sometimes advanced, that all of these books of Godfray's were published about 1532, merely because in that year he brought out an important dated edition of the works of Chaucer, simply will not stand up in the light of the religious developments of that period. As to the Psalter also, it makes sense to suppose that if Godfray was bringing out an unauthorized reprint of Joye's earlier Psalter of 1530, he might have been influenced to do so upon learning that Joye was putting forth a new version of the Psalms in August 1534. In other words, it appears to be a valid hypothesis that the Godfray Psalter was published in the latter half of 1534 and the Godfray Primer in the first half of 1535.

Returning to the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, two significant facts are to be noted: first, that Joye's name does not appear anywhere in these books; second, that the title page of the Proverbs describes them as "newly translated." Now these words, if taken at their face value, would imply that Godfray was bringing out a first edition of the work. But on the other hand, Joye was able to return to England (as we shall recount in due course) in the summer of 1535; and if Godfray received the new version of the Proverbs from Joye's hand at that time, there seems to have been no reason why Joye's name should have been withheld from the title page. As a matter of fact, in September of

1535 Joye himself published in London a brief work (not a Scriptural one, however) in which he does not scruple to let his name appear as the translator (see below, p. 200).

We should also bear in mind that in bringing out his Psalter and his Primer Godfray was making use of books that Joye had already published in Antwerp. This opens up a distinct possibility that the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes had likewise been published in an earlier edition in Antwerp, of which no trace remains. In any event, a small publication of some eighty-four leaves would hardly have been deemed a major achievement, and might, but for Godfray, have been lost sight of entirely. If we assume that there was in fact an earlier edition at Antwerp, then in calling the Proverbs "newly translated" Godfray was probably merely copying the wording which he found in the title of the earlier edition, just as he did with the Psalter.

There are two other facts which have some bearing on this problem of date. If these little books were originally issued as late as the middle of 1535, then there would hardly have been time for Coverdale to take account of them in the preparation of his Bible; whereas there is some evidence that he did know of the version given in the Proverbs at least. Also, Joye himself published an edition of the New Testament in January 1535, and at the end of this he included a section of "Epistles" taken from the Old Testament, one of which is drawn from the Book of Proverbs. For this occasion not only did Joye utilize the version he had made for his Proverbs of Solomon, but there is evidence that he revised a few verses of it when he was preparing to include it in the section of Old Testament "Epistles." In other words, he was revamping something which he had already done, as his custom often was.[21]

All in all, then, the most tenable deduction we can make from present information is that there was in fact an earlier edition of the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, doubtless from Antwerp and probably about 1533, and that Godfray reprinted this version for the London trade, probably about the end of 1534 or the early part of 1535. Of this reprint only one copy survives.

As the basis for his version of Proverbs Joye turned again to a current Latin version drawn from the Hebrew original, rather than to the Vulgate. Dr Mozley, in his *Coverdale and His Bibles* (p. 50), brings forward the information that this time Joye turned to Melanchthon, whose Latin version, *Sententiae Salomonis iuxta hebraicem veritatem summa cura redditae*, was published in Nuremberg in 1525.[22] The evidence fully bears out this relationship.

Notably, Melanchthon concluded his work with a collection of short sayings (*Dicta Sapientium*) presumably drawn from classical sources, certainly not scriptural; and these are duly reproduced at the conclusion of Joye's volume: "Thus endeth the pr*o*uerbes/ & her foloweth y*e* saye*n*gs of y*e* wise." Another telling piece of evidence is the heading of the thirtieth chapter of Proverbs. Here Melanchthon ran into difficulty with his Hebrew text, some of which he transliterated, thus:

> Sermo Agur filii Iake. Haec sunt praecepta quae tradiderunt Lithiel, Lethiel, & Ichal.

Joye accordingly follows Melanchthon's lead, somewhat blindly, and writes:

> These ar y*e* wordes of Agur the sonne of Iake, which doctryne and sente*n*ces of lythiell/ leithiell and Icall lefte.

Before dismissing the Sayings of the Wise, perhaps one or two typical specimens may be in order. Godfray, whose printing was not of the best, was here working with a small letter-press and his spellings and contractions make difficult reading.[23] Joye's version reads:

> Thrust nat thy self hedling [i.e., *headlong*] into perill.... Flie opprobri.... First delybre/ & then bende the to worke.... Mary a wife of egall degre/ lest she bei*n*g of a rich stocke/ thou gettest the lordes/ & no affinite.

The meaning of the last clause, as appears from the Latin, is, "Lest thou beget lordlings for thyself who are strangers unto thee."

Turning now to the Proverbs themselves, we note again Joye's customary freehanded use of words. Indeed, Melanchthon's Latin is so succinct, and Joye's rendition is so uninhibited, that the parallel between them is sometimes obscured. Consider, for example, Proverbs 8 : 24. Speaking of the beginning of wisdom, Melanchthon's Latin is suggestive though compact:

> Nondum abyssi erant cu*m* formarer, no*n*dum fontes aquis redu*n*dabu*n*t.

Joye's version is more expansive:

> Wha*n* I was conceyued/ yet were nat the depe derk waters/ neither yet any spri*n*ges brekynge forth into floudes.

Another interesting passage is in the thirtieth chapter (verses 13-15). Joye's rendering is characteristic:

> This kynde lyft vp their eyes/ & twincle with their eye lyddes.
> These whelpes haue teth lyke a swerde/ & their va*n*ghes [i.e., *fangs*] ar lyke a daggers poi*n*te/ to deuowre *ye* pore/ & to make a waye the carefull nedious. These horse leches haue two doughters cryeng/ haue done/ haue done/ bringe it hider/ a waye/ a waye.

According to Melanchthon, what the horseleach's daughters say is *Age*, *age*; that is, Do something. According to the Vulgate Bible, they say *Affer*, *affer*; that is, Bring it here. Joye straddles uncertainly and includes both meanings so as not to be found wanting. Note too the words "va*n*ghes" and "nedious" which suggest Joye's peculiarities of phraseology.

Even more telltale of Joye's authorship is a passage in the next chapter of Proverbs (31 : 8, 9), which he renders:

> Helpe the*m* that can nat speke for the*m* selfe in iugement [i.e., *judgment*]/ defende all socourlesse/ auenge & delyuer the pore abiectes.

Coverdale in his Bible seems to have picked up one of Joye's words at this point: "speake for all soch as be do*m*me & succourles." Again, further on in the same chapter (17-19), Joye speaks of the virtuous woman as industrious to do good, and tells us:

> She tucketh vp her self & stretcheth forth her armes vnto labor.
> She espieth *ye* profyte of her trauel: her ca*n*dle goth nat forth of all night.
> She recheth her rocke & pulleth forth her spyndle.

Here Coverdale picks up the rather obscure word "rocke" meaning distaff:

> She layeth hir fyngers to the spyndle, & her hande taketh holde of *ye* rocke.

All in all, the evidences of Coverdale's indebtedness to this little book of Joye's are less marked and less frequent than in his former translations. They consist mostly of a word here and there. Nevertheless, a few parallels showing some definite connection may be cited for what they are worth.

Dr Mozley[24] adduces two interesting examples from Proverbs 15 (but he has modernized the Joye-Godfray spellings). In verse 2 we have:

> [Joye] A wise tongue addeth grace to his cunning, but a foolish mouth blabbeth forth his folly.
>
> [Coverdale] A wyse tonge commendeth knowledge, a foolish mouth blabbeth out nothinge but foolishnesse.

And in verse 17:

> [Joye] Better it is to be boden to a mess of pottage with love than to a fat ox with hatred.
>
> [Coverdale] Better is a meace of potage with loue, then a fat oxe with euell will.

This latter instance is of special interest because we have here in Joye's Proverbs the earliest recorded use in Scripture of the familiar phrase, "a mess of pottage."[25]

Another parallel may be cited from Proverbs 20 : 14:

> [Joye] It is nought/ it is nought/ say men whan they haue it: but wha*n* it is gone they prayse it.

> [Coverdale] It is naught, It is naught (saye men) whan they haue it, but whan it is gone, they geue it a good worde.

Before leaving the Proverbs, we may cite an instance or two in which Joye's happier style is able to anticipate the popular form of some well-known saying. For example, it is only in Joye's version (16 : 18) that we come upon the simple and familiar wording of the proverb: "Pryde goth before a fall/ and a fall foloweth a proude mynde." [26] Again, in Proverbs 30 : 18, 19, Joye gives us this reading of a famous passage:

> Thre thinges I know nat/ & the fourth I can nat comprehende/ the way of an egle in thayre/ ye waye of the serpent ouer the stone/ the vorowe]i.e., *furrow*] of the shyp vpon the see/ and the waye of the yonge man towarde the mayde.

We come finally to Joye's little companion volume of Ecclesiastes. Here our information is very meager indeed. We do not know what text Joye used as the basis of his version. In fact, we have practically nothing to go upon but the translation itself. Neither Zwingli nor Melanchthon nor Bucer appears to have made any Latin version of Ecclesiastes. Mozley[27] comes to the conclusion that Joye was relying on Luther's German text, with liberal assistance from the Vulgate. But there is no solid evidence that Joye shared Coverdale's facility in the German tongue; indeed he seems rather to have been disdainful of it, preferring to work from the Latin. And if he relied on the Vulgate in this instance, he contradicted all his previous practice; for he certainly would not have used the Vulgate if he had had at hand some reformer's Latin text more to his liking.

It may be that some obscure Latin version of Ecclesiastes published during this period will still come to light.[28] But we can make no safe ascription at this time. A clue to Joye's possible source, if one should ever be discovered, is the beginning of the final chapter. In contemporary versions of Ecclesiastes (e.g., in the Coverdale Bible), it was not unusual to commence Chapter 12 with the last verse of Chapter 11.

But Joye begins his final chapter with the last *two* verses from Chapter 11. It is hard to suppose that Joye would have made this innovation on his own initiative. Yet (as we have said) we have still no satisfactory knowledge of his source, beyond those indicated by Dr Mozley.

Joye's translation has its own points of interest.[29] It is rendered in quite a free style, with occasional earmarks characteristic of Joye. Perhaps the following brief extract (Eccles. 7 : 27-29)[30] will sufficiently illustrate the manner of it:

> But lo/ at laste this thinge haue I founde (sayth this precher). This thinge and that I serched to fynd knowledge/ & yet ceased nat styll to enquyre/ although I fynde it nat. Amonge a thousande men I can skante fynde one profytable/ but amonge so many women/ I fi*n*de none at all. But lo/ this one thi*ng* haue I founde/ that god in the beginning made man iust & vpright but he with his posteryte haue entangled the*m* selues with moche crafte & infinyte questions.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7

[1] Collation: A-I^8, K-P^8 (120 leaves). It is remarkable that the two extant copies show a variance on fol. P7: the Cambridge copy reads, "¶ The songe of Moses and his Chirche/ songen aftir Pharaō s dethe/ drowned with his hoste in the ydde sea"; the BM copy has "aftir Pharasus dethe" and "in the redde sea."

[2] Similar in format to his Isaiah, Zwingli's Jeremiah was printed by Froschouer at Zurich and was entitled *Complanationis Ieremiae Prophetae, foetura prima, cum Apologia quur quidque sic uersum sit,* [etc.]. He prefaced the work with an elaborate dedicatory epistle to the Senators of Strassburg.

[3] Zwingli's Latin is very compact at this point: "... Nam si pietatem consideres, ardet; si eruditionem, nitet; si prudentiam, sapit; si fidem, perstat; si constantiam, vincit."

[4] For selections see Appendix B.

[5] E.g., "Israel that bakslyder" and "thou bakslyder Israel" (3 : 6, 12); "Israel that bakfaller" (3 : 8, 11); "you rebel bakslyden childerne" (3 : 14).

[6] However, Coverdale introduces "back slydynge" in his Bible of April 1540 where Joye had *not* used it, namely Proverbs 14 : 14; whence it passed into the Authorized Version through the Bishops' Bible.

[7] The Swiss-German Zurich Bible (1530) had "ein Mor."

[8] The Zurich Bible was issued in separate parts from 1524 to 1529; then as a whole Bible in 1530—*Die gantze Bibel/ der Ebraischen vnd Griechischen waarheyt*

nach/ auff das aller trewlichest verteütschet; then in a revised folio edition of 1531, and again in a smaller form in 1534. For Coverdale's use of this version see C. D. Ginsburg, *Coheleth, Commonly Called the Book of Ecclesiastes*, Appendix II; B. F. Westcott, *A General View of the History of the English Bible* (1927 ed.), pp. 163, 181, 311; J. Eadie, *The English Bible*, I, 281-292; and J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles*, pp. 83-98.

[9] For description of this first edition of the Marshall Primer see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, pp. 50-69.

[10] The statement that this 1534 version was based on the Latin of Felix Pratensis which was given currency by John Lewis in his *History of the English Translations.* (1739 ed., p. 88), is apparently without foundation.

[11] Collation: A-I^8, K-T^8, V^8, x-z^8, Aa-Ee^8. The colophon is very brief, reading simply "Martyne Emperowr. 1534."

[12] In Latin Psalters the ninth and tenth Psalms were combined as one and Ps. 146 was subdivided into two; hence for most of the Psalter the Latin numbering was one less than in the Hebrew text.

[13] For example, in the passage under consideration, Zwingli's German reads: "Ich bin glych wie ein pelican in der wüeste, ich bin wie ein üwel in der zerstörten wonung. Ich wach und bin wie ein verlasner spar uffem dach." In the Zurich Bible (1534) this reads: "... ein Pelican in der wüste, ich bin wie ein Owel in der zerbrochnen mauren. Ich wache/ unnd bin gleich wie ein Spar/ der allein auff dem tach sitzt."

[14] Coverdale's spelling of "Oule" threw the printer of the Matthew Bible into confusion. Both the Matthew Bible and the Taverner Bible read: "lyke an hole in a broken wall."

[15] Other parallels might be cited from Ps. 19 : 4, 5; 31 : 2, 5; 90 : 14, 15; 119 : 95. Dr Mozley in his *Coverdale and His Bibles* (p. 93) expresses the opinion that in the Psalter Coverdale leaned more toward Luther.

[16] For fuller discussion of these two books, see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, chap. viii and ix.

[17] For details of this Primer, see Butterworth, *The English Primers*, chap. vii.

[18] These two unique little volumes have been in the possession of a private collector in England since they were sold at auction by Sotheby & Co., January 28, 1946. Prior to that they were in the library of Sir Leicester Harmsworth, and still earlier in the Britwell collection. Photographs of their title pages may be seen in the Britwell Sale Catalogue for 1921. For transcripts from their text I am indebted to Maggs Bros. Ltd., London, and to Miss Teener Hall, former librarian of the Harmsworth collection. Dr Mozley has also provided me much useful information about these books, which he treats of briefly in *Coverdale and His Bibles.*

[19] Collation: A-G^8, H^4; A-C^8 (84 leaves altogether).

[20] See Mozley, *op. cit.*, p. 344.

[21] For further discussion see Butterworth, "The Godfray Edition of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes," [*Univ. of Penna.*] *Library Chronicle*, XV, 25. The most striking revision made by Joye was in Prov. 31 : 15, which reads thus in Godfray's edition: "She aryseth in y*e* night to p*re*pare meat for his household & pulle*n*." In the Joye Testament this becomes: "She aryseth erely to prepare meat for his housholde a*n*d minister worke to hir mayde*n*s." Joye's use of the word "pullen" is very curious. Melanchthon's Latin was *ancillis*. "Pullen" means poultry or chickens. Perhaps Joye was acquainted with Fitzherbert's *Boke of Husbandry* (1523) in which one of the duties of the farm wife (as cited in the *Oxford English Dictionary*) is "Gyue thy poleyn meate in the mornynge."

[22] Melanchthon's work went through a number of editions; e.g., Leipzig 1531 and Augsburg 1536. In some editions the title was changed to *Proverbia Salomonis*, [etc.] Passages cited here are from the 1536 edition.

[23] Godfray was partial to the spelling of "nat" for "not." In the sayings here cited, Melanchthon's Latin reads: "Ne teipsam praecipites in discrimen. ... Probrum fugito. ... Prius intellige, & deinde ad opus accede. ... Vxorem ducito ex aequalibus, ne si ex ditioribus duxeris, dominos tibi pares, non affines."

[24] *Coverdale and His Bibles*, p. 58.

[25] Curiously enough, this phrase does not occur in the text of any of the older Bibles in connection with the selling of Esau's birthright (Genesis 25 : 29-34); but it does occur in the "argument" at the head of Chapter 25 of Genesis which John Rogers supplied for the Matthew Bible. From this, the heading was taken over into the Great Bible and the Geneva Bible, and thus passed into popular use. The phrase is also found, of course, in the text of Prov. 15 : 17 in the Matthew Bible, following Coverdale's reading.

[26] Coverdale takes the high road in his Bible: "Presumptuousnesse goeth before destruccion," etc.

[27] *Op. cit.*, pp. 50, 56.

[28] For example, at Antwerp in 1533 Gerard Morinck brought out a Latin commentary on Ecclesiastes provided with a text (see *Brit. Mus. Cat.*, xvi, 992); but we have no reason to assume that Morinck was not perfectly orthodox, and thus his text was presumably drawn from the Vulgate. The work is not available for comparison.

[29] For selections from the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes see Appendix B.

[30] The word "posteryte" (verse 29) is interesting; it has no analogy in the Vulgate or Luther, except in their use of the plural number. But the phrase "infinyte questions" does have its parallel in the Vulgate *infinitis quaestionibus*.

8

The New Testament

We now turn to the episode in Joye's career for which he is best remembered—his unauthorized and in many respects ill-advised "editions" of William Tyndale's New Testament. It is an oft-told tale, having received some mention in virtually all accounts of Tyndale's work in the shaping of the English Bible. In most versions of the story Joye comes off badly; indeed in his conduct of the affair there is little to admire except his passionate zeal for the English Scriptures. But it may be worth while to marshal the facts once more, perhaps bringing them into sharper focus, not with intent to throw out of court the charges against Joye, nor with a predisposition to urge a verdict of "not guilty," but merely in the interests of a full and fair trial.

We need not review the early part of the story of Tyndale's New Testament in any great detail.[1] The reader will recall how the first printing at Cologne was interrupted by the authorities upon information supplied by Johann Cochlaeus, and how Tyndale and his assistant William Roye fled to Worms, carrying with them such sheets as had already been printed. These sheets, in quarto, containing probably only the Gospel according to St Matthew,[2] were put on the market late in 1525. At the same time another printing, in octavo, was carried forward at Worms as rapidly as possible. The Worms printing was completed probably in the early weeks of the new year.

It is a matter of record that copies of both the Cologne fragment and the complete Worms edition had reached England by March of 1526. By midsummer the books were circulating so freely that the bishops, who regarded the translation as heretical, were thoroughly alarmed. Early in October, Cuthbert Tunstall, the Bishop of London, warned the booksellers not to traffic in Testaments, and on October 24, he issued an injunction to the archdeacons of his diocese that they require all persons possessing copies to turn them in to the authorities. On November 3, Archbishop Warham issued similar injunctions to all the bishops of the province of Canterbury. Sometime between the two sets of injunctions, probably on Sunday, October 28, there was a great ceremonial burning of Testaments at Paul's Cross. Months later, in May and June 1527, Warham was still buying up Testaments in order to destroy them.

Partly as a result of these measures, and partly through the erosion of time, only one copy of the Cologne fragment survives, preserved in the Grenville collection at the British Museum. Of the Worms octavo, only two copies are known to be extant: an imperfect copy in the library of St Paul's Cathedral, and a complete copy, except for title page, in the Baptist College at Bristol. Hereafter this work will be referred to as T26.

Even before the Worms edition of the English New Testament was sold out, an enterprising Antwerp printer, realizing the extent of the demand, put out an unauthorized edition to catch the English trade. Copies flowed into England promptly. By mid-November, 1527, Wolsey's agents in Antwerp were on the hunt for the printer, who was finally identified as Christopher Van Endhoven. Endhoven was arrested, but the Antwerp authorities, despite pressure from England, were reluctant to punish him or destroy the books. Finally all discoverable copies were impounded and burned at Antwerp and Bergen-op-Zoom. Of this edition, which was apparently sextodecimo, between two and three thousand copies were printed. How many copies found their way into England before the remainder were destroyed it is impossible to say. No copy is known to survive.

In the epistle at the end of the Worms edition Tyndale had promised to put out a revised text when the need should arise. In the meantime, however, he had undertaken the study of Hebrew, and by 1527 he was ready to begin the formidable task of translating the Old Testament. The work proceeded steadily, although at one point it was grievously set back when Tyndale was shipwrecked with loss of all that he had completed thus far. Although there was a continuing demand for a new edition of the New Testament, Tyndale was understandably eager to press on with his work on the Old Testament. In 1530 he published a version of the Pentateuch and in 1531 a translation of Jonah. He continued with the other books in order, and by the time of his death in October 1536, he had completed in manuscript translations of the books from Joshua through II Chronicles. Along with his translations of the Pentateuch and of the New Testament, these were printed in the Matthew Bible of 1537, through the agency of its editor, John Rogers.[3]

Meanwhile, however, to satisfy the demand for English Testaments, Christopher Van Endhoven of Antwerp undertook, about 1530, to put out another unauthorized edition of Tyndale's translation. Although this edition also numbered between two and three thousand copies, no copy survives. Apparently the books were of a larger format than the unauthorized edition of 1527, probably octavo. Between them, the Endhoven editions of 1527 and 1530 numbered about five thousand copies. The supply of both editions was exhausted by 1534.

Accordingly, the printers (or perhaps Tyndale's friends) besought Tyndale to hasten with the revision of the New Testament translation which he had promised in 1526. But Tyndale, busy with the Old Testament and with the controversial tracts which came from his pen in these years, worked quite slowly on the revision in the intervals between his other labors. At this point the Antwerp printers approached George Joye. In his *Apologye* of 1535 Joye gives us his version of his involvement in the business, and by way of preface an account—which is indeed our only account—of Endhoven's first two unauthorized editions. After pointing out, no doubt with entire truth, that these editions had been full of errors, "to the hurt and deceyt of the byers and reders of them," he continues:

But I shall now playnly & sengly (for the trowth knoweth no fucated [i.e., *disguised*] polesshed a*n*d paynted oracion) declare vnto euery man/ wherof/ howe/ and by who*m* I was moued a*n*d desyred to correcke this false copie that shulde els haue brought forth mo the*n* two thousand falser bokes more then euer englond had before.

First/ thou shalt knowe that Tindal aboute .viii. or .ix. yere a goo tra*n*slated and printed the new testame*nt* in a mean great volume [i.e., *a medium large volume, no doubt the Worms octavo of 1526*]/ but yet wyth oute Kalender/ co*n*corda*n*ces in the margent/ & table in thende. And a non aftir the dwche men gote a copye & printed it agen in a small volume adding the kale*n*dare in the begynning/ co*n*corda*n*ces in the marge*nt*/ & the table in the*n*de. But yet/ for that they had no englisshe man to correcke the setting/ thei themselue hauyng not the knowlege of our tongue/ were compelled to make many mo fautes then were in the copye/ & so corrupted the boke that the simple reder might ofte tymes be taryed & steek. Aftir this thei printed it agein also without a correctour in a greater letter & volume with the figures in thapocalipse whiche were therfore miche falser then their firste. when these two pryntes (there were of them bothe about v. thousand bokis printed) were al soulde more then a twelue moneth a goo/ Tind. was pricked forthe to take the testame*nt* in ha*n*de/ to print it & correcke it as he professeth a*n*d p*ro*myseth to do in the later ende of his first tra*n*slacio*n*. But T. p*ro*lo*n*ged & differred so necessary a thing a*n*d so iust desyers of many me*n*. In so miche that in the mean ceason/ the dewch me*n* prynted it agen the thyrde tyme in a small volume lyke their firste prynt/ but miche more false the*n* euer it was before. And yet was T. here called vpo*n* agen/ seyng there were so many false printed bokis stil put forth & bought vp so fast (for now was ther geue*n* tha*n*ked be god a lytel space to breath & reste vnto christis chirche aftir so lo*n*ge & greuouse p*er*secucion for reading the bokes) But yet before this thyrd tyme of printing the boke/ the printer desiered me to correcke it: And I sayd It were wel done (if ye printed the*m* agene) to make the*m* truer/ & not to deceiue our nacio*n* with any mo false bokis/ neuertheles I suppose that T. hi*m*self wil put it forth more p*er*fait & newly corrected/ which if he do/ yours shalbe naught set by nor neuer solde. This not withsta*n*ding yet thei pri*n*ted them a*n*d that most false & aboute .ij. M. bokis/ & had shortly solde the*m* al.[4]

This then is Joye's account of three unauthorized editions of Tyndale's New Testament. The third of these was probably published in the last weeks of 1533 or the early weeks of 1534, and probably by the widow of Christopher Van Endhoven, who had been carrying on the business after her husband's death a short time before. As with the two earlier Endhoven editions, no copy of this third edition survives. By his own account Joye had no part in its preparation. He had been asked to correct the copy in a work the text of which had become increasingly corrupt as the type was set in edition after edition by Flemish printers and the proof read by correctors who had at best only a smattering of English. He had declined the offer. But the fact that he was approached in the matter lends substance to the belief that he had already had considerable experience as a corrector for the press and was known to the Endhoven house as a man well qualified for the job at hand.

Meanwhile, said Joye, Tyndale "slept." It would have been more accurate to say that Tyndale was working with great deliberation. It is clear that Joye knew that Tyndale's work of revision was in progress; all of the English reformers at Antwerp would have known that. But Joye was unaware of the exact stage of Tyndale's work, for Tyndale had not taken him into his confidence. And Joye was impatient at Tyndale's delay, for the business of bringing Testaments to English readers was, as Joye had said, "so necessary a thing." Accordingly, when the Endhovens approached him a second time, probably in the spring of 1534, he yielded to their persuasions and agreed to correct their next edition—the fourth—which was already beginning to come off their press.

Let us hear once more from Joye himself:

> Al this lo*n*ge while T. slept/ for nothing came fro*m* him as farre as I coude perceiue. Then the dewche bega*n* to printe the*m* the fowrth tyme because thei sawe noma*n* els goyng aboute them/ & aftir thei had printed the first leif which copye a nother englissh ma*n* had correcked to them/ thei came to me & desiered me to correcke the*m* their copie/ who*m* I answered as before/

> that if T. ame*n*de it with so gret dilige*n*ce as he p*ro*mysethe/ yours wilbe neuer solde. Yisse quod thei/ for if he prynte .ij. m. & we as many/ what is so litle a nou*m*ber for all englo*n*d? & we wil sel ours beter cheape [i.e., *more cheaply*]/ & therfore we doubt not of the sale: so that I p*er*ceyued well & was suer/ that whether I had correcked theyr copye or not/ thei had gone forth with their worke & had geue*n* vs .ij.m. mo bokis falselyer pri*n*ted the*n* euer we had before. The*n* I th*us* considred with myself: englo*n*d hath ynowe & to many false testame*n*ts & is now likely to haue many mo: ye & that whether T. correck h*is* or no/ yet shal these now in ha*n*d goforth uncorrecked to/ except some body correck them: And what T. dothe I wote not/ he maketh me nothing of his cou*n*sel/ I se nothyng come fro*m* him all this long whyle. wherin with the helpe that he hathe/ that is to saye one bothe to wryte yt a*n*d to correcke it in the presse/ he myght haue done it thryse sence he was first moued to do it. For T. I know wel was not able to do yt with out siche an helper which he hathe euer had hitherto. Aftir this (I saye) co*n*sydered/ the printer came to me agen a*n*d offred me .ij. stuuers a*n*d an halfe for the correcking of euery sheet of the copye/ which folde*n* co*n*tayneth .xvj. leaues/ & for thre stuuers which is .iiij. pense halpeny starling/ I promised to do it/ so that in al I had for my labour but .xiiij. shylyngis flemesshe/ which labour/ had not the goodnes of the deede & comon profyte & helpe to the readers co*m*pelled me more then the money/ I wolde not haue done yt for .v. tymes so miche/ the copie was so corrupt & especially the table: & yet saith T. I did it of couetousnes: If this be couetessnes/ the*n* was Tindal moche more covetouse/ for he (as I herd say) toke .x. ponde for his correccion.[5]

The financial side of the contract into which Joye had entered with the Flemish printers may require a word of explanation. After a little haggling, Joye had agreed to a stipend of three stivers for revising each sheet—that is, for each gathering of sixteen leaves. The Flemish stiver was worth about 1½*d.* in English money, so that Joye received the equivalent of 4½*d.* for each sheet. The completed volume contains fifty-five full sheets, plus six leaves of an additional sheet. This works out almost exactly to the 14*s.* Flemish which Joye said he received. The equivalent in English money was just under 21 shillings, which would have been worth about £50 (or a little more than $140) in terms of today's money. Joye's complaint that he was underpaid, in view of the state of the text he was called upon to correct, was fully warranted, although his assertion that Tyndale received £10 for his work of revision was entirely irrelevant.

Joye's work was completed by midsummer 1534, and in August the edition was on the market. The book was a handsome sextodecimo volume, a single copy of which is extant.[6] The title page reads in full as follows:

> The new Testament | as it was written/ and caused to | be written/ by them which herde | yt. Whom also oure saueou | re Christ Jesus com | maunded that they | shulde preach it | unto al crea | tures. The Gospell of S. Mathew | The Gospell of S. Marke | The Gospell of S. Luke | The Gospell of S. Jhon | The Actes of the Apostles. | Joelis.ii. | I will poure oute my spryte u- | pon all flesshe/ and youre sonnes | and youre doughters shal prophe | sy/ youre yonge men shall se visi- | ons/ a*n*d youre olde men shal drea- | me dreames.

The first sentences of the title page and the words "Joelis .ii." are printed in red; the remainder is in black. The whole of the title is enclosed in an ornamental border.

At signature Aa 1 is a second title page, as follows:

> The Epistles of the | Apostle. S. Paul. | To the Romayns. | To the Chorinthians .ij. | To the Galathians. | To the Ephesians. | To the Philippians. | To the Collossians. | To the Tessalonians. ij. | To Timothe. .ij. | To Titus. | To Philemon. | The Epistles of .S. Peter. ij. | The Epistles of .S. Jhon .iij. | The Epistle unto the Ebrues. | The Epistle of .S. James. | The Epistle of Jude. | The reuealacion of Jhon.

The colophon is at signature Bbb 1:

> ¶Here endeth the new | Testament diligently o- | uersene and corrected/ | and prynted now agayn | at Antwerpe/ by me wy-| dowe of Christoffel of | Endhoue*n*. In the ye- | re of oure Lorde. | M. CCCCC. | and .xxxiiii. in August.·.

Immediately after the title page is an almanac, running to twelve pages, for eighteen years beginning with 1526. Following the colophon, and taking up ten pages, is a calendar of the liturgical Epistles and Gospels for days of special celebration throughout the year according to the use of Sarum. There are cross-references in the margins, but only one marginal note.

The single extant copy of the book was once the property of George Paton, the well-known Edinburgh antiquary. When his books were sold after his death in 1807, it brought thirty guineas. Later still it was purchased for twice that amount by the bookseller and publisher Archibald Constable. Later it passed into the hands of Thomas Grenville, and is now one of the treasures of the Grenville library in the British Museum.[7] Hereafter this volume will be referred to as J34.

In the remainder of this chapter I propose merely to describe what Joye did with Tyndale's text in correcting the sheets of this volume for the press, reserving for the next chapter a consideration of the ethics of his conduct and his ensuing quarrel with Tyndale. Joye's primary task for the Widow Endhoven had been to correct the text—that is, to remove typographical errors and other corruptions introduced by the Flemish printers into the three unauthorized editions of Tyndale's New Testament. It would seem reasonable to assume that this meant correcting proofs pulled from the formes which they had used for their third edition. Presumably Joye would have done this by referring to the text of the Tyndale octavo of 1526, if a copy were available to him.[8] As a matter of fact, the close correspondence between T26 and J34 in spelling, in an age when spelling was a highly individual matter, renders it likely that Joye did indeed work from a copy of T26. He himself tells us that he went further than his function as press-corrector required, and had beside him a copy of the Vulgate from which to check the accuracy of Tyndale's rendering—this on the assumption that St Jerome's Latin rendering of the Greek was more reliable than Tyndale's English rendering.

It is not now possible to determine how formidable was the task confronting Joye. Most writers on the subject have asserted that Joye's textual corrections (aside from his revisions) were trifling in number.

But this is not fair to Joye. It is based on a comparison of J34 with T26. But T26 is not the text which Joye was correcting. He was correcting the corrupt Endhoven text, no copy of which survives for comparison. Under the circumstances, it is a fair assumption that the fewer the points of divergence between T26 and J34, the more efficiently did Joye perform his assigned task. All that can now be said with accuracy is this: a careful study of the two texts reveals some palpable errors in T26 uncorrected by Joye, and a number of errors—either of Joye's own or carried over from the Endhoven text—which are not found in T26. But on the whole, considering the state of the printing trade at the time and the fact that both texts had been set up by non-English compositors, J34 and T26 are remarkably close.

It would be tedious and fruitless to list all the minor textual variations between T26 and J34.[9] A few examples will be sufficient. In Acts 9 : 24, T26 reads, "But ther *awayte* wer knowen of Saul." Joye corrects this to "layinges awayte," his use of the plural corresponding to the Vulgate. In John 3 : 36, Tyndale's "he that *beloveth* not the sonne" is corrected to "beleueth." In John 6 : 15, Joye reads, "Jesus knew wele ynough/ that they wolde come and take him uppe/ to make him kynge," where T26 had omitted the important phrase "to make him kynge." Joye likewise supplied a missing phrase in Romans 12 : 13 by adding the words "kepe hospitaliter" after "Distribute unto the necesitie of the saynctes."

Among the uncorrected errors are the following. In Luke 12 : 37, T26 reads, "Happy are those servauntis/ which their lorde ... shall fynde *walkynge*." Joye allowed the error to stand, but Tyndale corrects it to "wakynge" in his own revision. (Hereafter Tyndale's revision, which will be described in the next chapter, will be referred to as T34.) In Acts 15 : 3, Joye fails to change Tyndale's "*conversacion* off the gentyls" to "conversion." In Luke 16 : 10, T26 had lost the sentence "And he that is unfaithfull in the least: is unfaithfull also in moche." Joye fails to restore it, but Tyndale does so in T34.

In some cases it is difficult to tell whether Joye has changed a word intentionally or whether the alteration is a typographical error in Joye's text. Examples are Mark 14 : 50, "and they all forsoke hym and came awaye," where T26 has "ranne awaye"; and Matthew 3 : 3, "make his pathes ryght," where T26 has "strayght." Both of these differences are probably typographical in origin. On the other hand, in Luke 24 : 14, Joye's "as they comerced together" for Tyndale's "commened togeder" may be an intentional change.

Turning now to Joye's intentional changes, we find that many of them are minor alterations in style. Joye will begin a sentence with *and* where Tyndale does not; he will drop the initial *and* where Tyndale uses it. Joye is more fond than Tyndale of the two-syllable prepositions *into* and *unto*. He sometimes changes a participial to a finite construction—"thus saying" becomes "and said." Joye seems partial to the reflexive construction; Tyndale's "Repent" is changed to "Repent ye" in several instances. Sometimes Joye seems to modernize an old-fashioned expression: "every whit whoale" becomes "altogether whole." Sometimes it is the other way round, as when he changes Tyndale's "sho latchet" to "shone latchet." Altogether there are several score of such changes. It is difficult to make any valid generalizations about them.

In some instances Joye seems to attempt, with little success, to make Tyndale's phrasing smoother or more idiomatic. Here are some examples. (In each case the T26 reading is given in square brackets.)

Matthew 7 : 18 ...nor yet a bad tree *can not* [*can*] bringe forth good frute.
Matthew 8 : 18 ... he *commaunded them* [*commanded*] to go....
Mark 2 : 24 *Se* [*Take hede*]/ why do they on the sabboth daye that which is unlaufull? (AV: *Behold*)
John 10 : 36 ...off hym whom the father hath sanctifyed and sent into the worlde saye ye then that I blaspheme ...[...saye ye then to him whom the father hath sainctified and sent into the worlde: Thou blasphemest ...]
Philemon 1 : 21 ... thou wilt do more than I *speke fore* [*saye fore*].

I John 5 : 16 There is a synne unto death: for which *saye I that a man shulde not praye* [*saye I not that a man shulde praye*].

Luke 17 : 20 The kyngdom of god commeth not *with any outwarde lokynge fore* [*with waytinge fore*]. (AV: *with observation.*)

We turn now to those passages in which Joye deliberately revised Tyndale's words in order to give what he believed to be a more accurate rendering of the sense. Here also it has been customary for writers on Tyndale to say that these revisions are few and in most instances trifling. These terms are relative. According to our count, Joye made about 150 such revisions; allowing for duplications (as in the change of *seniors* to *elders*), there are about a hundred. Some are indeed trifling; a few are improvements which found their way into later versions, including the Authorized Version; some correspond to Tyndale's own revisions in T34; some are mistakes; some are wrongheaded. Joye himself asserts that his authority for these revisions was the Vulgate; certainly he did not have enough Greek to make any important use of the Greek text. But it is clear that for some of his most daring revisions there is no more authority in the Vulgate than in the Greek. In the sampling which follows, Tyndale's original will again be given in square brackets immediately following Joye's corresponding word, phrase, or sentence. Where the matter seems significant, the readings of T34 and later versions are given in parentheses.

We give first ten miscellaneous instances. Some are relatively insignificant; others are of some theological import:

Matthew 16 : 18 ...thou arte *Stonne* [*Peter*]. And upon this same *stoune* [*roocke*]/ I wyll bylde my *chirche* [*congregacion*].

Mark 8 : 2 ...my herte *pytyeth* [*melteth on*] thys people ... (T34: *I have compassion on*).

Luke 2 : 14 ...unto men a *reyouse reconcylinge* [*reioysynge*]. (*Reyouse* is probably a misprint for *ioyouse.*)

Luke 9 : 20 Peter answered and sayde/ thou arte the *anoynted* [*Christ*] of God.

Acts 6 : 9 ...certayne of the *scole or college* [*sinagoge*]/ which are called libertines. ...

Romans 8 : 3 ... and *by the oblacyon for synne he pourged synne* [*and by synne damned synne*] in the flesshe. ...

I Cor. 10 : 16 ...ys not the cuppe off *thankis geuing* [*blessinge*] which we blysse/ *the felowship* [*partakynge*] off the bloude of Christ? is not the breed which we breake/ *the felowship* [*partetakynge*] of the body of Crist?

I John 2 : 2 ... he yt is that *is the satysfaccion* [*obteyneth grace*] for oure synnes. ... (AV: *propitiation.*)

Hebrews 1 : 3 ... *hys myghty worde* [*the worde of his power*]. ...

Jude 1 : 12 ... Trees roten in *haruest* [*authum*] unfrutful. ... (T34: *trees with out frute at gadringe tyme*).

In a good many instances, Joye's revisions correspond to the revisions in T34. Since Tyndale affirmed, as we shall hear later, that he had not read through Joye's volume, it follows that the two men, working independently, arrived at the same results. Here are four examples.

Luke 16 : 22-23 The ryche man also *dyed and was buryed. And he now beynge in hel ...* [*died/ and was buried in hell.*]

John 5 : 45 ... *euen* [*verely*] Moses in whom ye truste.

I Cor. 4 : 16 Wherfore I desyre you to *folowe* [*counterfayte*] me. (In five other places Joye changes *counterfeit* to *follow*; in every case T34 has either *follow* or *be followers.*)

Hebrews 13 : 21 The God off peace ... make you perfet in *all good workys* [*all workes*]. ...

Probably in this class of revisions should be included Joye's changes of *senior* to *elder*. It will be recalled that Tyndale's rendering of πρεσβύτερος as *senior* had been one of the points in Sir Thomas More's charge that in some places Tyndale had wilfully mistranslated in the interest of his theological views. The word occurs sixty-one times in the New Testament. In T26 Tyndale translated it as *senior* in every case except one—in Hebrews 11 : 2, "By it the elders were well reported off," where he may have been influenced by the Vulgate's *senes*. (In passing it may be pointed out that the Vulgate rendering of πρεσβύτερος is *senior* in fifty-three of the sixty-one occurrences of the word.) Joye, perhaps influenced by More's criticism, undertook to correct Tyndale's rendering. But in this case he was extraordinarily careless: he revises in only thirty-five places, whereas in T34 Tyndale revises it in every instance. In thirty-three cases Joye substitutes *elder* for *senior*. In I Peter 5 : 1 he inexplicably substitutes the word *priest*—"The preistis whych are amo*n*ge you I exhorte/ which am also a preist." In Titus 1 : 5, perhaps misled by the occurrence of the word *bishop* in verse 7, he replaces *seniors* with *bishops*—"thou shuldest ... ordeyne byshops in euery citie ..."

In about twenty instances, of varying degrees of interest and importance, Joye made changes which, though not found in T34, correspond to the renderings of later versions, including the King James. The following are perhaps the most interesting:

Mark 15 : 40 ... James the *lesse* [*lytle*] (Geneva, AV: *less*).
Luke 2 : 19 But Mary kept all those *thyngis* [*sayinges*]/ & pondered the*m* in hyr hert. (AV : *things*).
John 1 : 21 Arte thou *that* [*a*] prophet? (Matthew, Great, AV: *that*).
John 6 : 23 ... where they ate breed/ *aftir* [*when*] the lorde had *gyuen thankis* [*blessed*]. ... (Coverdale, Great, Geneva, AV: *given thanks*).
John 12 : 25 He that loueth his lyfe shall *leese* [*destroye*] yt. ... (Coverdale, Geneva, AV: *lose*. Joye's *leese* is not a misprint but an obsolete form of *lose*).
Revelation 22 : 2 ... of ether syde of the ryuer was there *trees* [*wode*] of lyfe ... and the leues/ of the *trees* [*wodde*] serued to heale the people with all. (Geneva, AV: *tree* ... *tree*).

Here also should be mentioned two instances where Joye by reference to the Vulgate, revised Tyndale's over-literal rendering of the Greek. In Luke 19 : 48, T26 reads: "For all the people *stacke* [i.e., stuck] *by* him. And gave him audience." Joye alters this to "For all the people depended on hys mouthe. And gaue him audience" —thus eliminating the over-literal *stacke by* but falling into the trap of an un-English idiom. The AV has, "for all the people were very attentive to him." In I Corinthians 4 : 3, T26 reads: "With me it is but a very smale thinge/ that I shulde be iudged of you/ other of mans *daye*." *Day* is indeed the primary sense of the Greek, but Joye very sensibly changes it to *judgment*, an alteration which has the sanction of later versions. It should be added that in both these instances Tyndale retained the T26 readings in T34.

From the examples exhibited thus far one might conclude that Joye had performed a reasonably efficient job in revising Tyndale. Unquestionably, in a number of instances he had improved upon Tyndale's renderings. On the other side, however, must be set the fact that in his attempts at revision Joye perpetrated a number of egregious errors. A few examples follow:

Luke 11 : 4 And forgyue us oure sinnes/ *yf* [*for even*] we forgyue euery man that traspaseth agaynst us.

Acts 6 : 1 ... there arose a grudge amo*n*ge the grekes agaynste the ebrues because theyr *pore nedy* [*wyddowes*] were *neglecte* [*despysed*] in the dayly *almose dealinge* [*mynystracion*].

Acts 6 : 2 ... yt is not mete that we shulde leaue the worde of god and *minister the almose* [*serve at the tables*].

[Joye, as we shall hear in the next chapter, was especially fond of these revisions in Acts 6 : 1-2.]

Romans 5 : 7 A man wil skant gladly dye whe*n* he must iustely die: but for a vauntage paraduenture he dare put him silfe in parel of dethe [Yett scarce will enyman deye for a rightewes man. Paraventure for a good man durst a man deye].

I Corinthians 11 : 5 Euery woma*n* that prayeth or *hereth the sermon* [*prophesieth*] bare hedded/ dishonesteth her heade.

We must also consider those revisions which reflect Joye's crotchets. One of these is his fondness for the word *preach*. In at least two cases he uses *preach*—"preachynge serueth not for them that beleue not" (I Corinthians 14 : 22) and "But an yf all preache" (I Corinthians 14 : 24) —where Tyndale has *prophesy*; and in another place—"so must thou preche me at Rome" (Acts 23 : 11)—where Tyndale has *bear witness*. Another of Joye's crotchets is his dislike of the word *worship*, which he changes at least five times—e.g., “Then she cam a*nd* *fyl downe before* [*worshypped*] hym” (Matthew 15 : 25). Others are his consistent substitution of the now obsolete verb *instant* for *constrain* or *compel*; his quaint use of the verbal form *peaced* for Tyndale’s *delight*—for example, “Thou arte my dere sonne/ by whom I am peaced” (Mark 1 : 11); and his insistence, especially in Hebrews 9 and 10, upon *covenant* in place of Tyndale’s *testament*.

Of all his eccentricities of translation, however, the most striking is his substitution, in twenty places, of some such phrase as *the life after this* for *resurrection*. A good many of the twenty instances are to be found in the narrative, repeated in all three synoptic gospels, of Jesus’ encounter with the Sadducees. The account in Matthew 22 may serve as our example:

> The same daye the saduces cam unto him (which saye that there is no lyf after this) and they asked him sayinge Master/ Moses bade/ yf a man dye hauynge no chyldre*n*/ that the brother mary his wyfe/ and reyse uppe seed unto his brother. There were with us seue*n* brethre*n*/ the fyrst after he maryed died with out yssewe/ & lefte his wyfe unto his brother. Lykewyse the seconde a*nd* the thyrd/ unto the seuenthe. Laste off all the woman dyed also. Nowe in the *lyfe after this* [*resurreccion*]/ whose wyfe shal she be of the .vij? for al had her. Jesus answered a*nd* sayde unto the*m*: ye are deceaued a*nd* knowe not what the scripture meaneth/ nor yet the vertue of god: For in the *lyfe after this* [*resurreccion*]/ they nether mary/ nor are maryed: but are as the au*n*gels of god in heauen.
>
> As touchynge the *lyfe of them that be deed* [*resurreccion off the deed*]: haue ye not redde what is sayde unto you of god/ which sayeth I am Abrahams God/ and Isaaks God/ and the God of Jacob? God is not the god off the deed: but off the lyuynge.

Joye made similar revisions not only in Mark 12 and Luke 20, but also in Luke 14, John 5, Acts 23 and 24, Romans 6, and Hebrews 11. In each case, the background for the change was Joye’s conviction, amounting almost to an obsession, that the souls of the saved do not sleep till doomsday, as Luther believed, but are already present with

Christ in glory. We have already heard of this controversy in connection with Joye's letter to Latimer,[10] and we shall hear of it again in the next chapter. Here it is sufficient to point out that Joye's belief concerning the present state of the souls of the righteous did not, at least in his own mind, conflict with a belief in the general corporal resurrection at the Last Day. Accordingly, he allowed the word *resurrection* to stand in about twenty places where he believed it referred only to the general resurrection and not to the present state of the souls departed.

In summary, then, it is possible to make a few general comments concerning Joye's edition of Tyndale's New Testament. As a corrector for the press Joye seems to have done a reasonably competent job. The number of *unintentional* differences between T26 and J34 is comparatively small, considering the stage of development of the craft of printing and the fact that both books were set up by non-English compositors. On the other hand, the *intentional* changes, whether trifling alterations of style or important modifications of sense, are numerous. Yet their total effect is negligible and they exerted little influence upon the gradual evolution of the English Scriptures. Certainly it would be absurd to speak of Joye's *version* of the New Testament.

If George Joye had been content to correct the typographical errors which had crept into the Endhoven editions of Tyndale, historians would probably regard his work merely as a bibliographical curiosity. It is possible that Tyndale himself would have ignored the book; certainly he would not have lashed out furiously at Joye. But Joye dared to tinker with Tyndale's language in one important point—the word *resurrection*. It was this impertinence, as Tyndale regarded it, which provoked the quarrel which is the subject of our next chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8

[1] The best account is in J. F. Mozley, *William Tyndale*, chap. iv and Appendix C.

[2] The Cologne fragment is said to have had signatures A-K. The single extant copy (*S.T.C.* 2823) lacks the title page and runs only through signature H. The text breaks off at Matthew 22 : 12. The present writer agrees with Mozley that this was the only printing in quarto; the supposed Worms quarto is a ghost.

[3] Concerning the Matthew Bible, see Mozley, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-186, and the same writer's *Coverdale and His Bibles*, pp. 125-146.

[4] Folios C3^{v}-C5^{r}.

[5] Folios C5^{r}-C6^{v}.

[6] *S.T.C.* 2825. Collation: Sextodecimo in eights. Signatures ✠, a-z, A-H, Aa-Xx, Aaa-Ccc 6. Contents: ✠ 1, title page. ✠ 1^{v}- ✠ 7^{v}, "An almanacke for .xviii yeres." ✠ 8^{r}-H8^{v}, the text through the Acts of the Apostles. Aa 1^{r}, an inner title page. Aa 1^{v} to Bbb 1^{r}, the text, Romans through Revelation. Bbb 1^{v}, the colophon. Bbb 2^{r}-Bbb 6^{v}, the table of the liturgical Gospels and Epistles. (Bbb 6^{v} also contains instructions for binding.)

[7] Herbert's Ames, III, p. 1831; Christopher Anderson, *The Annals of the English Bible*, I, 394. The Grenville copy contains a slip of paper with the following handwritten note: "The present copy was bought by me from Thorpe who had purchased it from Constable in Edinburgh, after his bankruptcy in 1826."

[8] There is no evidence that Joye referred to the Cologne quarto, where some of the readings would have been helpful to him.

[9] The fullest comparison hitherto made is in Francis Fry, *A Bibliographical Description of the New Testament: Tyndale's Version in English with Numerous Readings, Comparisons of Texts, and Historical Notices*, pp. 40-43. Unfortunately, Fry's comparison of the Tyndale–Joye texts is quite unreliable. He seems to have compared J34 with Tyndale's own revision of a few months later (T34) rather than with T26. Fully half of the Joye variants he cites are not variants at all; they correspond exactly to the readings of T26. Many other writers have fallen into the same trap. Mozley's comparisons are accurate, but he gives only a small sampling. Appendix C of the present volume gives a list of fifty of Joye's revisions which are not cited in this chapter.

[10] See above, pp. 95-96.

9

The Quarrel with Tyndale

MODERN writers have tended to speak of the Endhoven editions of Tyndale's New Testament as "pirated." To do so is probably an anachronism. For decades after the invention of printing, as in all the literate centuries which preceded, the notion of literary "property" was rudimentary, if it existed at all. Innumerable cases might be cited from the first century of the trade in printed books of a single work issued in several editions by as many different printers or publishers with no question of literary "piracy" arising. The fact that the literary work we are here considering was a translation of Holy Scripture made the problem even less difficult. No one could claim author's rights in the Word of God, and as yet the question of the rights of the translator had not been raised.

Tyndale, as far as we know, had made no complaint against Christopher Van Endhoven or his widow with regard to their first three editions of his New Testament. Nor would he have protested at the fourth had its text been corrected by some Englishman unknown to him. But his indignation was aroused in the first instance because this fourth Endhoven edition had been corrected secretly by a supposed friend, one of his own party, so to speak, who, knowing that Tyndale's own revision was well advanced, nevertheless entered into a contract with a competitor in order to anticipate Tyndale and thus catch the trade. Thus Tyndale's first charge against Joye was breach of friendship. Joye's reply, as we have seen, was that he did not know what stage Tyndale's own revision had reached, that Tyndale was slow, that the Endhovens would have printed in any case, and that it was important that their text be as correct as possible. The first of these excuses is at best a half-truth. The others may be true statements of fact, but they are not responsive to Tyndale's charge of breach of friendship. Of this charge Joye stands condemned.

Even so, Tyndale tells us, he would have kept silent had Joye been content to remove the corruptions from the Endhoven text, for Joye was known to be avaricious and vainglorious and his conduct was understandable. Tyndale might even have refrained from comment if Joye had corrected the palpable errors in the text of T26, or even if he had ventured to make a few stylistic improvements. The history of the printed English versions of Scripture from Tyndale's to the King James is largely a history of revisions, most of them silent, in the interests of accuracy or style. Joye had a sound understanding of this fact when he wrote:

> And I doute not but there be/ & shal come aftir us/ that canne & shall correcke our workes a*n*d translacions in many places & make them miche more perfayt & better for the reader to vnderstande/ and shulde we therfore brawll & wryte agenst them as T. dothe agenst me? god forbyde. ...[1]

Except for the sneer at Tyndale this is well said. But it evades the fundamental reason for the second and principal part of Tyndale's protest, which was this—that Joye, in the interest of advancing one of his own theological views, had wilfully mistranslated an important word and by not acknowledging the translation as his own had fathered the mistranslation upon Tyndale.

Apart from the charge of breach of friendship, Tyndale's criticism of Joye relates solely to the latter's tampering with the word *resurrection*. The Greek word is *ἀνάστασις*—literally, "a standing up again." The Vulgate consistently renders it *resurrectio*. Neither etymologically nor historically was there authority for Joye's figurative rendering *the life after death*. Joye's chief offense—the only one which Tyndale could not condone—was an offense against theological and biblical scholarship. He had insinuated into the text a debatable interpretation which should have been reserved for a marginal note or a commentary. And he had done so in such a way as to make it appear that the interpretation was Tyndale's. Joye's reply to the charge was, "I wolde the scripture were so puerly & plyanly [*sic*] translated that it need nether note/ glose nor scholia/ so that the reder might once swimme without a corke."[2] Tyndale did not find the defense persuasive. Nor do we.

The heart of the controversy between Tyndale and Joye was their difference of opinion on the theological question of the present state of the souls departed. It therefore becomes necessary to relate the history of this ancient quarrel; happily, the historian is under no obligation to adjudicate it.

The first document in the story is Tyndale's own first revision of his New Testament, which was published within three months of the publication of Joye's book. This was an unpretentious octavo, printed at Antwerp by Martin Emperor (de Keyser). The title page reads simply:

> ¶The ne- | we Testament | dyly | gently corrected and | compared with the | Greke by Willyam | Tindale: and fynes- | and shed in the yere of ou | re Lorde God. | A.M.D. &. xxxiiij. | in the moneth of | Nouember.

The book (which we have already denominated T34) differs from T26 not only in Tyndale's revisions of the text itself but also by the addition of a table of the Gospels and Epistles after the use of Sarum and of marginal cross-references, both of which pieces of apparatus were included in J34. Tyndale also adds marginal notes, some of which are merely explanatory, others controversial; and he includes also translations of the passages from the Old Testament which were appointed to be read at Mass on certain days of the year in place of the liturgical Epistles. Finally he adds prologues or prefaces to each of the Pauline and other Epistles, except that a single prologue serves for all three of the Epistles of John and one also suffices for both James and Jude. Of these prologues, the most considerable is that to Romans, which had been separately published some years earlier.

Of immediate importance to our purpose, however, are the two addresses to the reader which are set at the beginning of the book. The first of these is devoted chiefly to a discussion of the proper uses of Scripture. But three sentences in the second paragraph may contain an acidulous comment upon Joye:

> If anye man fynde fautes ether with the tra*n*slacion or ought besyde (which is easyer for manye to do/ then so well to have translated it them selves of their awne pregnant wyttes/ at the begynnynge withoute forensample) to the same it shalbe lawfull to tra*n*slate it themselves and to put what they lust therto. If I shall perceave ether by my selfe or by the informacion of other/ that ought be escaped me/ or myght be more playnlye translated/ I will shortlye after/ cause it to be mended. Howbeit in manye places/ me thynketh it better to put a declaracyon in the margent/ then to runne to farre from the text.[3]

All this would seem to be quite relevant to what Joye had done. But it was not sufficient to express the full extent of Tyndale's wrath at Joye's presumptuousness. Accordingly Tyndale added a second preface —"William Tyndale/ yet once more to the christen reader"—in which, to the extent of about two thousand words, he gave full vent to his feelings about Joye. It is a hard-hitting document, written by a justifiably angry man. Since it has often been reprinted, a brief paraphrase will serve our purposes:

> Joye knew, says Tyndale, that I was revising my New Testament, yet he secretly undertook to correct for the Endhovens. I thought, when I first heard about it, that he was prompted by covetousness and vainglory, for I knew these to be among his weaknesses. When Joye's book was printed I didn't trouble to look at it. But then, when the printing of my revision was almost finished, I was shown a copy of Joye's book. I was shocked to discover that throughout Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and sometimes in John, Acts, and Hebrews, he had changed my word *resurrection* to *life* or *very life*, as if he abhorred the word *resurrection*. I therefore denounce Joye because he did not put his name to the book and call it his own. He plays "bo-peep," sometimes putting his name to his books, sometimes not. He is free to make

his own translation; but he must not silently revise mine and father the revisions upon me.

For a long time (Tyndale continues) Joye has had strange notions about this word *resurrection*. He has written letters about it and caused dissension among the brethren. John Frith, when he was in the Tower, wanted to write against him, but I dissuaded him from doing so. The chief trouble is that Joye's teachings have led many people to deny the physical resurrection. Does Joye himself deny it? He must answer for himself.

Joye will say that his rendering represents the true sense of Scripture. But even if it is the true sense, Tyndale asks, what would happen if every man were to "play bo-peep" with Scripture by putting out the word and substituting what he believed to be the sense? Surely this would give rise to all sorts of heresies. If a translator has notions such as Joye's, he should put his interpretation into a marginal gloss. In the end the text will purge itself of false glosses.

Now concerning the doctrine at issue. I believe, says Tyndale, that Christ is risen in the flesh which He received from the Blessed Virgin and in the body in which He died. I believe that all of us, good and bad, will rise flesh and body at the Last Day and appear before the judgment seat of Christ. I believe that the bodies of all who believe and continue in the faith of Christ will be endowed with the same immortality and glory as is the body of Christ. As for the souls of the departed, I believe them to be in no worse state than was the soul of Christ in the three days between His death on the cross and His Resurrection. But I am not persuaded that the departed souls of the saved are already in the full glory that Christ and the angels are in. If it were so, the doctrine of the corporal resurrection would have little significance.

As I hope for salvation, Tyndale concludes eloquently, I have not translated with the intention of proving any doctrine or of founding a sect or of glorifying myself. I write only to bring my blind brethren to the knowledge of Christ. I care for the well-being of England and of the King and his people as a mother would care for her only son. I pray God to have mercy on us all.

Then, that the purchaser of an English Testament might not buy a copy of Joye's revision instead of the authentic text, Tyndale quotes quite accurately the colophon of the Endhoven edition and gives its exact location in the volume.

The foregoing summary may convey the substance of Tyndale's thought. But it fails completely to suggest the intensity of his indignation. In order that the reader may not miss the emotional tone of Tyndale's criticism of Joye, the penultimate paragraph of his address is here given verbatim:

> Wherfore I beseche George Ioye/ ye & all other to/ for to translate th*e* scripture for them selves/ whether oute of Greke/ Latyn or Hebrue. Or (if they wyll nedes) as th*e* foxe when he hath pyssed in th*e* grayes hole chalengeth it for his awne/ so let them take my translacions & laboures/ & chaunge & alter/ & correcte & corrupte at their pleasures/ and call it their awne translacions/ & put to their awne names/ & not to playe boo pepe after George Ioyes maner. Which whether he have done faythfully & truly/ with soche reverence & feare as beco*m*meth the worde of God/ & with soche love and mekenes & affeccion to unite and circu*m*spexcion that the vngodlye have none occasion to rayle on the verite/ as beco*m*meth th*e* servauntes of Christ/ I referre it to the iudgeme*n*tes of them that knowe and love the trouth. For this I protest/ that I provoke not Ioye ner any other man (but am prouoked/ & that after the spytfullest maner of provokynge) to do sore agaynst my will and with sorow of harte that I now do. But I nether can ner will soffre of anye man/ that he shall goo take my translacion and correct it without name/ & make soche chaungynge as I my selfe durst not do/ as I hope to have my parte in Christ/ though the hole worlde shuld be geve*n* me for my laboure.[4]

Joye's first reply to Tyndale came in an address to the reader appended to a second edition of Joye's revision (J34). This, the fifth Endhoven edition, was published on January 9, 1535. It survives in a single copy preserved, like its predecessor, in the British Museum. It was acquired by the Museum in 1904, before which time it had been lost sight of for centuries.[5] The title page is missing—a misfortune, since we would like to know if Joye, in the light of Tyndale's criticism, had caused his name to be put on the title page—as are six other leaves. The book is a sextodecimo in eights,[6] identical in text with J34 except for the addition of the "Epistles" from the Old Testament and a three-page address to the reader by George Joye. The colophon, which in J34 preceded the table, now appears at the end, at signature C8 verso, and reads as follows:

> ¶The ende of the hole new Testament | with the Pistles taken out of the olde | Testament/ to be red in the chirche | certayn dayes thorowt the year. | Prynted now agayne at Ant- | werpe by me Catharyn wy- | dowe [the words "of Christoffel of Endhouen" omitted probably in error]/ in the yere of oure | lorde. M.CCCCC. and | xxxv. the .ix daye of | Januarye.·.

We shall hereafter refer to this volume as J35.

Joye's address "Unto the Reader" is particularly interesting for its account of the personal relationship between him and Tyndale. Since the address has not been reprinted for nearly half a century and is difficult to come by, it is here reproduced in its entirety:

> Unto the Reader
>
> ¶Thus endeth the new Testament prynted after the copye corrected by George Joye: wherin for englisshyng thys worde Resurrectio/ the lyfe after this. W. Tindale was so sore offended that he wrote hys uncharitable pistle agenst me prefixed [to] his newe corrected testament/ prynted .1534. in Nouember/ entytled. W. T. yet once more to the Christen redere. Which pistle W. T. hath promysed before certayne men & me (or els I wolde my selfe haue defended my name & clered myselfe of those lyes and sclaunders there writen of me) that he wolde calle agene his Pystle and so correcte yt/ redresse yt/ and reforme yt accordinge to my mynde that I shulde be there wyth contented/ and vs bothe (as agreed) to salute the readers withe one salutacion in the same reformed pistle to be set before his testament now in printing. And that I/ for my parte/ shulde (a rekeninge and reson firste geuen of my translacion of the worde) permyt yt vnto the iudgement of the lerned in christis chirche. Which thynge/ verely I do not onely gladly consent there to/ vpon the condicion on his

parte/ but desyer them all to iuge/ expende and trye all that euer I haue or shall wryte/ by the scriptures.

Let yt not therfore in the mean ceason offende the (good indiffere*nt* reder) nor yet auerte thy mynde nether W. Tindale nor fro me: nor yet fro*m* redyng our bokis whiche teche a*nd* declare the very doctryne a*nd* Gospel of Christe/ because yt thus chaunceth vs to varye a*nd* co*n*tende for the trewe englisshing of this one worde Resurrectio in certayne places of the newe Testame*nt*. For I doubt not but that God hathe so prouyded yt/ that our stryfe a*nd* dyssent shalbe vnto hys chirche the cause of a perfayter co*n*corde & co*n*sent in thys mater/ Noman to thinke hence forth that the soulis departed slepe with out heauen feling nether payne nor ioye vntill domes daye as the Anabaptistis dreame but to be a lyue in that lyfe after thys whithe/ a*nd* in Christe in blysse a*nd* ioye in heuen/ as the scriptures clerely testifye. Whych verite a*nd* true doctrine off Christe & his apostles/ as yt is a swete a*nd* present co*n*solacion vnto the pore afflicte persecuted and trowbled in thys worlde for Christis sake when they shall dye/ so doeth the tother false opinion and erroneouse doctryne/ that is to weit/ that they sleap out of heauen nether feling payn nor ioye/ minyster a*nd* geue perellous audacite a*nd* bolde suernes to the vngodly here to lyue styl a*nd* continew in their wickednes/ sith they se & be so taught that aftir their departing there is no punysshment but sleap a*nd* reste as wel as do the soulis of the good and ryghteous tyll domes daye. Which daye as some of the*m* beleue it to be very longe ere yt come/ so do many of them beleue that yt shal neuer come. Also to stryue for the knowlege of the trowth with a meke a*nd* godly co*n*tencion hathe happened vnto farre perfayter me*n* then we be bothe/ Nether haue there bene euer any felowship so fewe and smal/ but some tyme syche breache and imperfeccion hath hapened emonge them for a lytle ceason (as I trust in god this shal not co*n*tinew longe betwene vs two) ye a*nd* that euen emonge the apostles as betwene Paule & Peter/ and Paule and Bernabas. This thing (I saye) may fall vpon vs also to lerne men that all men be but lyers a*nd* maye erre/ and to warne vs that we depende

Gala. ij.
Acto. xv.

> not wholl vpon any mannis tra*n*slacion nor hys doctryne nether to be sworne nor addicte to any ma*n*nis lerning/ make he neuer so holye and deuoute protestacions and prologs/ but to mesure all mennis wrytingis/ workis a*n*d wordis wyth the infallible worde off God to whom be prayse and glory for euer.
>
> Amen.

Since Tyndale's principal charge had to do with Joye's alleged heterodoxy concerning the corporal resurrection, it is not surprising that Joye devoted most of his address to an assertion of the correctness of his views on that topic. Our immediate concern, however, is with the substance of the first paragraph.

Joye's reference to Tyndale's "testament now in printing" perhaps needs clarification. Immediately after the publication of T34, Tyndale began work on a second and, as it proved, final revision of his Testament. The printing of this volume began in December 1534 (within a month, it will be observed, of the publication of T34) and was completed probably in January of 1535. This is the edition commonly known as G-H, from the initials of the publisher, Godfried Van der Haeghen, on an inner title page. It was in this volume, according to Joye, writing some time before January 9, 1535, that Tyndale had agreed to publish some sort of retraction or modification of the "uncharitable pistle" of 1534. Joye amplifies his account of this understanding with Tyndale in his *Apology*,[7] which we shall consider shortly, but in neither account is it entirely clear what the agreement was. Something like the following seems to have occurred.

When he read Tyndale's epistle, Joye was outraged. He immediately prepared a defense which he intended to publish. Mutual friends, however, dissuaded him from doing so and at the same time persuaded Tyndale to tone down the epistle in his forthcoming revision. Having agreed to this, Tyndale (according to Joye) went even further. He suggested that in place of the epistle he would print a statement, prepared jointly by himself and Joye, "to testifye our concorde"—a statement, presumably, which would demonstrate that both men were sound and at one in their views on the corporal resurrection. Their differences concerning the present state of the souls departed were to be left to the judgment of the learned. Whatever the precise agreement was, Joye clearly expected Tyndale's forthcoming revision to contain some sort of retraction, or some sort of joint statement, or both. But when G-H was published, Tyndale included neither a retraction nor a joint statement. Instead, without comment, he simply omitted the unfriendly epistle, thus wisely indicating that as far as he was concerned the incident was closed. Tyndale's latest and best biographer believes that Tyndale felt that in publishing J35, with its appended address to the reader, Joye had committed an unfriendly act which released Tyndale from any agreement that had been made. On the other hand, the publication of G-H followed so closely upon the publication of J35 that it is possible that Tyndale's decision was made before he had any knowledge of the contents of J35.

However that may be, Joye was outraged. He immediately set about the completion and publication of the defense which he had projected at the first. This apologia took the form of a small octavo volume,[8] of which the only copy known to survive is in the library of Cambridge University. The title page reads as follows:

> ¶An Apologye made by Geor | ge Joye to satisfye (if it maye be) W. Tin | dale: to pourge & defende himself ageinst | so many sclaunderouse lyes fayned upon | him in Tindals uncharitable a*n*d unsober | Pystle so well worthye to be prefixed | for the Reader to induce him in- | to the understanding of hys | new Testament diligent- | ly corrected & prin- | ted in the yeare | of oure lor- | de .M. | CCCCC. and | xxxiiij. in Nouember. | [space] ¶I knowe and beleue that the bodyes of euery | dead man/ shall ryse agayne at domes daye. | [space] ¶Psalme .cxx. | Lorde/ delyuer me from lyinge lyppes/ | and from a deceatfull tongue. Amen.∴ 1535

The precise date, February 27, 1535, is given at the end,[9] but there is no colophon. The printing has been ascribed to John Byddell of London on the basis of the similarity of the type to that of a known publication of Byddell's—an English translation of Joachim Van

Watt's *The old god and the newe* (*S.T.C.* 25127).[10] An examination of microfilm copies of both books does in fact reveal close similarity in the type-faces, but is not entirely conclusive that the types were both from the same font. It is difficult to understand how and why Joye, living in Antwerp and in close association with Antwerp printers, should have arranged to have his book printed in London. On the contrary, the circumstances surrounding the book make it tempting to speculate that it may have emanated from the house of Endhoven.

The intemperate language and heavy irony of the title page of the *Apology* are excessive even in an age when heavy irony and intemperate language were the normal characteristics of controversy. These qualities pervade the whole book, which is further marred by repetitiousness and incoherence. Nevertheless, the *Apology* is an interesting historical document. Although Joye does not succeed in vindicating himself against Tyndale's charges—how could he?—he makes some telling points. He begins with his reasons for publishing the tract. After repeating and amplifying his account of the agreement which he believed he had made with Tyndale, he tells a story of Tyndale's delays and cavillations.[11] Five or six days after the agreement was made, Joye says, he went to Tyndale to see the "correccion and reformacion of hys pistle." But Tyndale had given the matter no further thought. Five or six days later Joye tried again. This time Tyndale said the epistle had been revised but was illegible as it stood. To this Joye replied that he was perfectly familiar with Tyndale's handwriting and would manage to decipher it, but Tyndale refused to show it. On a third occasion Tyndale insisted on seeing a written statement of Joye's views on the resurrection and the state of the souls departed so that he might refute Joye's errors. But according to Joye this was not what had been agreed upon; each man was to present his own views independently, leaving it to the learned to judge between them. When Joye approached Tyndale a fourth time, Tyndale again demanded to have Joye's arguments in writing, because he intended to submit them, along with his own replies, to Dr Robert Barnes, the eminent English reformer who was then residing in Antwerp, and to Aepinus, the learned pastor of the church of St Nicholas in Hamburg. But this was even less satisfactory to Joye. He warned the friends who had acted as peacemakers between him and Tyndale that unless the latter lived up to his agreement he, Joye, would be compelled to go ahead with his original plan to publish his own defense. With the appearance of G-H it was obvious that Tyndale had failed to keep his promise—because, Joye said, he was unwilling to acknowledge that he had been wrong.

All this is extremely circumstantial. If it is wholly correct, then Tyndale must be charged with something less than ingenuousness in his handling of the matter. But I suspect another explanation. It is that Tyndale had indeed agreed to some modification of his denunciation of Joye, but that with respect to the rest of the agreement Joye had been led by his own hopes to misinterpret Tyndale's promises. No doubt Tyndale had suggested that he and Joye write statements of their divergent opinions and submit them to the learned. But that he ever proposed that such a debate, with a man whom he considered a second-rate scholar and theologian, should appear as a kind of foreword to an edition of his English Testament, seems highly unlikely. It is possible that Joye was persuaded that he was reporting the facts correctly. Reading between the lines, one can believe that Tyndale, not a very patient man in his contacts with other people, found Joye's pertinacity in the matter increasingly irritating. In the end, he kept his bargain simply by suppressing the epistle which had offended Joye.

Tyndale, in the "unfriendly" epistle, had asserted that Joye had long been obsessed by the question of the state of the souls departed. In the *Apology* Joye confirms the fact that he and Tyndale had long been at odds on the matter. As far back as 1530, says Joye, Tyndale had asserted in his controversy with Sir Thomas More that the souls of the faithful departed slept out of Heaven until doomsday awaiting the general resurrection, and More had refuted him.[12] Joye here in some measure misrepresented Tyndale's position; the latter had merely said that he reserved judgment, since Scripture did not speak clearly on the subject. But Tyndale or whoever had made the index to Tyndale's book had used the words "Souls sleep" for the reference to the relevant passage, and this confirmed Joye in his certainty that Tyndale did in fact believe that the "souls sleep." Accordingly, Joye undertook to reason with him:

> Aftir I had sene theise places and known Tindals erroneouse opinion I resoned wyth hym as we walked togither in the feeld more then once or twyse: bryngyng ageynst him siche textis as me thought/ proued playnely agenst hym/ as when christe answerde the theif hangyng by his crosse saying. This daye thou shalt be with me in paradys. ... But these playn testimonyes of the scripture wolde take no place with Tindal/ for he wrested & writeth them co*n*trary to his own doctryne out of their proper & pure sence with fayned gloses to shift and seke holes/ he aftir his wont disdaynful maner agenst me fylipt them forth betwene hys fynger & his thombe/ & what disdaynfull a*n*d obprobrious wordis he gaue me for so resoning agenst hym I wyll not now reherce/ lest I shuld minysshe the good opinio*n* that some men haue in him.[13]

So Tyndale was unpersuaded, and exasperated as well. Joye believed that "aftirwarde in hys exposicion upon John he stretched forth his penne agenst me as farre as he dirst/ but yet spared my name/ at the whiche chaleng I winked/ yet taking yt not as ment of me because I loued quyetnes not wylling that any man shuld know what hatred he did euer beare me sense I came ouer."[14] Tyndale's *Exposition of the fyrste epistle of seynt Jhon* (*S.T.C.* 2443) had been published at Antwerp in 1531. The passage to which Joye refers reads as follows:

> Another thinge is this/ al the scripture makyth mention of the resurreccion and commyng agene of Christ: and that al men/ both they that go before/ and they that come after shal then receaue their rewardes to gether/ and we are commaundyd to loke euerye houre for that daye. And what is done with the soules frome theyr departinge their bodies unto that daye/ doethe the scripture make no mention/ saue only that they rest in the lorde and in their faith. Wherfore he that determyneth ought of the state of them that be departed/ doeth but teach the presumptuouse imaginations of his awne

> brayne: Nether can his doctrine be any article of our faith. What God doeth with them is a secret laide up in the treasury of God. And we ought to be patient/ beinge certified of the scripture that they which die in the faith are at rest/ & ought no moare to serche that secret/ then to serche the houre of the resurreccion which God hath putt only in his awne power.[15]

Tyndale adds, sharply, that to formulate articles of faith without the authority of Scripture is to do the work of the devil. There can be little doubt that Joye's suspicion that this passage was directed against him was well-founded.

As time passed, others were drawn into the controversy. Joye wrote to Latimer, as we have seen, to ask that reformer's views, with what result we do not know.[16] According to Tyndale, John Frith, in the Tower awaiting his own last ordeal, was so strongly opposed to Joye's views that he was dissuaded from writing against Joye only by Tyndale's pleas for peace among the reformers. But according to Joye it was not entirely certain that Frith was on Tyndale's side; Frith had kept silence. "...whether he winked at T. opinio*n* as one hauyng experience of Tindals complexion/ or was of the same opinion I ca*n*not tel/ the ma*n* was ientle & quyet & wel lerned & better shuld haue ben yf he had liued."[17]

So the dispute continued until it broke into print in the addresses to the readers attached to T34 and J35. Joye professed to believe that in the end he had won Tyndale over.

> But at laste I reme*m*ber that I made hym thys reason/ saynge. Syr ye knowe that christe is our head/ & we his members/ & altogither hys bodye/ ye knowe also that christe is the firste frutis/ & fore leader of them that sleap/ Then I argewed thus/ The bodye must nedis folow the head/ & whother the head we*n*t thither must the bodye folow (for crist optayned of his father that wheresoeuer he shuld be/ there shulde his faithful be with him to se his glorie) but christis spirit departed slept not oute of heue*n*/ but wente into the fathers ha*n*dis in heue*n*/ wherfore euen so shall ours aftir our dethe/ if we dye his me*m*bres a*n*d in the lorde: This reason did so byght Tindal/ and stoke so faste vpon hym that he coude not shake it of/ but is now at laste (tha*n*ked

> be god) co*n*strayned to saye with me in hys goodly godly pistle age*n*st me/ that I thynke (he dare not yet co*n*sta*n*tly affyrme it) the soulis departed in the faith of crist to be in no worse case then the soule of criste was fro*m* the tyme he delyuered his spirit into the ha*n*dis of his father untyll the resurreccion of hys bodye.[18]

There would be little profit, and certainly no pleasure, in reviewing, point by point, the debate between Joye and Tyndale concerning the present state of the souls departed. All that Tyndale had to say on the subject has already been summarized. Joye's own best statement is to be found in the epistle subjoined to J35. In the *Apology* he repeats and amplifies that statement, but not very coherently and adding little that is substantive. The recurrent theme is that the Scripture is plain and clear on this subject, despite Tyndale's assertion that this is one of God's secrets. When Christ said to the Sadducees that "in the resurreccion they nether mary nor are maryed: but are as the aungels in heaven," He spoke in words of the present tense of the souls of the redeemed already in Glory, not of their bodies which would rise to judgment at the general resurrection. Says Joye:

> Criste had al power geuen him in heue*n* & erthe aftir his dethe a*n*d resurreccio*n*/ & that eue*n* the power to preserue the dead alyue in their soulis which power of god he tolde the Saduceis they knew not/ & yet by his godhed he did daily execute yt: he had powr also to iuge/ althoughe he be the sonne of ma*n*/ whiche powr then geue*n* him is not idle and voyd til domesdaye/ but is dayly executed in the particlare iugeme*n*t of euery soule departed. ...[19]

In the *Apology*, Joye makes it clear that what had stung him most sharply was Tyndale's charge that Joye, whatever his own opinion might be, had led others to deny the resurrection of the body. In all that he had ever said or written, Joye asserted, he had clearly affirmed his belief in a general resurrection at the last day, when the bodies of the justified would be reunited with their souls which were already with Christ. As for the charge that his views concerning the present state of the souls departed had led others to deny the general resurrection, Joye challenges Tyndale to produce or name one of those whom he professed to have talked to. As a matter of fact, says Joye, Tyndale has merely repeated, without verification, the lies of malicious men whom Joye could name if he wished. These men dare not openly confront Joye, and Tyndale has behaved unchristianly in repeating their unsupported allegations.

At times Joye's reasoning is effective; at others he reminds one of a schoolboy making "points" in a debate. At all times, unfortunately, beneath his professions of Christian forbearance, he is mean-spirited, and convicts himself of a kind of hypocrisy which must alienate the sympathies even of those who might share his views on the theological question at issue. Again and again he speaks disparagingly of Tyndale's personal qualities. Usually, as in the passages quoted above, his technique of denigration is of the slantwise variety—"What things I could tell if I were so minded!" Tyndale was arrogant, jealous, irritable, slow in his work, could never have finished his translations if he had not had two assistants, and so on. The charges that Tyndale was at times impatient and angry may be true; but it requires no great exercise of imagination to understand Tyndale's irritability in the face of Joye's nagging persistence. There may be a substratum of truth also in Joye's charge that Tyndale was guilty of intellectual pride—"yet herd I neuer sobre & wyse ma*n* so prayse his owne workis as I herde him praise his exposicio*n* of the v. vj. & vij. ca. Mat. in so myche that myne eares glowed for shame to here him."[20] In this instance, however, Joye invalidates the charge by adding that Tyndale's exposition of Matthew was merely a translation of Luther's, a palpable exaggeration which comes perilously close to downright falsehood.

In the light of what modern research has demonstrated concerning Tyndale's qualifications as a translator and theologian, the most unwarranted of Joye's criticisms of Tyndale is that the latter was a poor scholar and that Joye himself was qualified to correct his errors. Just the opposite was true. For his time, Tyndale was a highly competent Grecian. Joye was at best a tyro. Yet Joye repeatedly suggests that

Tyndale's Greek was inadequate to his high task and that places that were "dark" in Tyndale's New Testament needed illumination by Joye. Tyndale's Englishing of ἀνάστασις (*resurrectio*) was the most noticeable, said Joye, but it was by no means the only one. Among other instances Joye cites Acts 6 : 1, part of which Tyndale had rendered, "... there arose a grodge amonge the grekes agaynste the ebrues/ because theyr wyddowes wer despysed in the dayly mynystracio*n*." Lest it appear that the apostles were ministered to at table by certain Hebrew widows whom they despised, Joye changed this to "theyr pore nedy were neglecte in the dayly almose dealinge." Joye was inordinately proud of this revision, although there was no authority for it, and sent word of it to Tyndale. The latter understandably ignored it.[21] We may see in Tyndale's failure to accept Joye's revision merely a sign of Tyndale's good sense and superior scholarship. But to Joye it was clear proof of Tyndale's arrogance and jealousy of a rival in the field. "Tindale verely might neuer abyde yt/ that I especially (whether he so thynketh of wother me*n* god knoweth) shuld translate/ wryte/ or medle wyth the scriptures/ as thoughe the holy goste with hys giftis were restrayned vnto onely Tin. & might not breath where hi*m* listeth/ as though Tin. were lerned onely/ & none but he."[22]

It is in the last paragraph of the *Apology* that Joye appears at his worst. His self-righteous assertion that he had done nothing to warrant Tyndale's criticism, that he was the abused and Tyndale the abuser, will repel even those who otherwise might condone his corrections and revisions of Tyndale's New Testament.

> But had it bene my enimye that thus had uniustely reuyled and vexed me/ I coulde haue borne him/ And yf my hater had thus oppressed me/ I coude haue had avoyded hym. But yt was thou my nowne felowe/ my companion in lyke perel and persecucion/ my familiare/ so well knowne/ vnto who*m* I co*m*mitted so louingly my secretis/ with who*m* gladly I went into the house of god.[23]

Unfortunately, the pharisaical cant of these words shows through today as plainly as it did four centuries ago.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9

[1] *Apology*, fol. D6.

[2] *Ibid.*, fol. C7.

[3] Fol. *2.

[4] Fol. **7^{r}-**7^{v}.

[5] It was purchased by the Museum for £100 on March 14, 1904 from a Mr G. B. F. Hancock, of 39 Mincing Lane, E.C. The Museum has no record of its earlier owners.

[6] Collation: 16^{mo} ✠, a-z, A-H, Aa-Xx, Aaa-Ccc, A-C, in eights. Folios ✠ 1 [title-page], 2, Ee 1, Bbb 1, Bbb 8-Ccc2, Ccc 6-8, A 1 are missing. Contents: ✠ 1^{r}, title page. ✠ 1^{v}, blank[?] [✠ 2^{r}]-✠ 7^{v}, Kalendar. ✠ 8^{r}-H8^{v}, text through Acts. Aa1, inner title page to the Epistles. Aa 1^{v}, blank. Aa 2^{v}-Aaa 8^{v}, text through Apocalypse 22 : 5. [Bbb 1, Apocalypse 22 : 6-21]. Bbb 2-Ccc5^{v}, The Table through "Petri ad Vincula." [Ccc 6-A1, the remainder of the table]. A2-C 6^{v}, "¶ The pistles taken out of the Old Testament." C 7–C 8, "Unto the Reader." C 8^{v}, colophon.

This volume was first described by Alfred W. Pollard in *The Library*, 2nd ser., VI (1905), 10-19. According to Pollard the binding is contemporary with the text, but it must have been re-handled after 1611, for at each end there is a leaf from an edition of the Authorised Version. In this article Pollard reprinted for the first time the text of Joye's address "Unto the Reader." He printed it again, along with relevant passages from Joye's *Apology*, in his *Records of the English Bible*, pp. 178-195.

[7] Fol. A2^{r}-A2^{v}.

[8] *S.T.C.* 14820. Collation: 8°. A-G4, 44 leaves. Contents: A 1, title page. A 1-G4, text.

[9] Fol. G4^{v}.

[10] C. E. Sayle, *Early English Books in the University Library, Cambridge*, I, 112.

[11] *Apology*, A2^{v}-A3^{v}.

[12] *Ibid.*, A4^{r}.

[13] *Ibid.*, C 1^{r}.

[14] *Ibid.*, D8^{r}-D8^{v}. See also A6^{v}.

[15] *Ibid.*, E3^{r}.

[16] See above, pp. 95-96.

[17] *Apology*, E 1^{v}.

[18] *Ibid.*, C 1^{v}-C2^{r}.

[19] *Ibid.*, E6^{v}.

[20] *Ibid.*, F3^{v}.

[21] *Ibid.*, F4^{v}-F5^{v}.

[22] *Ibid.*, G3^{v}.

[23] *Ibid.*, G4^{v}.

10

The "Epistles" from the Old Testament

It is pleasant to turn from this ancient but still disagreeable quarrel to the final matter which must be considered in connection with George Joye's revision of Tyndale's New Testament. Even here, however, an echo of the old controversy will be heard.

It will be recalled that Tyndale included in his own first revision (T34) translations of some of those passages from the Old Testament which were appointed to be used on certain days in the proper of the Mass in place of the liturgical Epistle. A good many such passages were appointed for use throughout the Christian year. A few were used on Sundays, but most of them were for weekdays and saints' days. From the whole number Tyndale chose thirty-nine: those for the Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent and Lent (including Ash Wednesday and Good Friday) and in the Ember Week preceding Michaelmas; for Epiphany and the Sunday following Epiphany; for the Sunday next before Advent; and for the following days of special observation—St Nicholas (December 6), the Immaculate Conception (December 8), St John Evangelist (December 27), the Purification of the Virgin (Candlemas, February 2), the Annunciation (Lady Day, March 25), SS. Philip and James (May 1), the Nativity of John the Baptist (June 24), the Visitation (July 2), St Mary Magdalene (July 22), the Assumption (August 15), St Matthias (October 18), and St Catherine (November 25). In T34 these Lessons (as they are properly called) followed immediately after the text of the Apocalypse, with the following heading:

> These are the Epistles taken out of the Olde Testament/ which are red in the church after the vse of Salsburye vpon certen dayes of the yere.

Now the "Epistles" included in this section did indeed follow the use of Salisbury (Sarum)[1] with the exception of that for St Catherine's day, which followed the use of Hereford (Ecclesiasticus 51 : 9-12) instead of the use of Sarum (Ecclesiasticus 51 : 1-8). But in addition to this variation, which may have been intentional, Tyndale committed several small inaccuracies. The Lesson appointed for the Wednesday of the fourth week of Advent was Joel 2 : 23-24; 3 : 17-21; Tyndale added verses 25-27 from Joel 2. The appointed passage for St John Evangelist Day was Ecclesiasticus 15 : 1-6; Tyndale omitted verse 4. The appointed Lesson for St Nicholas' day was Ecclesiasticus 44 : 16, 17, 19-23; 45 : 3, 7, 16; Tyndale devised a *pasticcio* of verses and half-verses from Ecclesiasticus 44 : 17, 19, 20, 21, 23; 45 : 7, 4. Four other slips may have been the fault of the printer. The Lessons for the Wednesday and Friday of the third week in Advent were in reverse order, although they were headed correctly. The Lesson for the Sunday next before Advent (called by Tyndale the last Sunday after Trinity Sunday) from Jeremiah 23 was incorrectly cited in the margin as from Jeremiah 33. The Lesson for the Friday in Ember week before Michaelmas, from Hosea 14, was incorrectly cited as from Hosea 13. The Lesson for St Matthias' day was incorrectly labeled as being for St Matthew's day.

It would appear that when T34 was published, Joye, piqued by the "unfriendly epistle," went through the volume with microscopic eyes in search of errors to which he might call attention in his own forthcoming second edition. He fastened, we must suppose with gleeful malice, upon these small variations and mistakes in Tyndale's selections and upon a few slips in the text itself. Accordingly, he included these lessons from the Old Testament in J35, carefully using the correct passages, giving the correct citations, correcting a few errors in the text, and pointedly calling attention to the fact that he had done so in an ill-natured prefatory comment:

> ¶Here folow the pistles taken oute of the olde Testament/ to be red in the chyrche certayn dayes thorowt the year: tra*n*slated by George Joye/ & co*m*pared with the Pistles pointed forth a*n*d red in the messe boke/ and also withe the chapiters alleged in the Byble: so that nowe here they maye be founde easlyer then euer before. Whiche thys my laboure in translatyng these pistles in correcking & redressing them to make them correspondent wyth the chapters alleged in the byble/ a*n*d with the pistles red in the chirche/ whether yt be more diligent then hathe ben shewd hitherto/ let the indifferent reders be iuges.

When we turn to Tyndale's G-H edition of 1535, we discover that some of the errors in the T34 text of these Old Testament lessons have been corrected along Joye's lines. The Lesson for St Catherine's day now corresponds to the use of Sarum. In the Lesson for St John Evangelist's day, the missing verse has been inserted. The Lesson for the Friday in Ember Week before Michaelmas is now correctly cited as from Hosea 14. Some of the slips in the text have been corrected and correspond to Joye's readings. On the other hand, the other mistakes listed above remain uncorrected. Since J35 was published in January 1535, and in all probability G-H was not published until some weeks or months later, one would naturally conclude that Tyndale or his assistants took cognizance of Joye's corrections in preparing the copy for G-H. It was perhaps because they were working hastily, under pressure, that they failed to note all of Joye's corrections, and so some of the errors in T34 remained in G-H.

But Dr Mozley, whose opinions on these matters cannot be lightly dismissed, has advanced another explanation.[2] Among other details, he notes that the Lesson for St Catherine's day in G-H (Ecclus. 51 : 1-8, instead of Ecclus. 51 : 9-12 as it had been in T34) is almost identical in wording with Joye's version. He believes that Tyndale, a proud man of independent mind, would at all costs have made his own translation of this passage rather than include Joye's translation in his book. Moreover, Mozley finds the style of the St Catherine's day passage more in the style of Tyndale than in the style of Joye when the latter is translating independently. He notes also that several of Joye's supposed revisions in other passages correspond to the readings of G-H, and he is unwilling to believe that Tyndale is indebted to Joye for these revisions.

Dr Mozley finds an answer to the puzzle in the fact that G-H, although it bears the date 1535 on the title page, has an inner title page dated 1534, a fact which suggests that the printing of G-H was begun before the publication of Joye's second edition. It is Mozley's belief that Joye in some way contrived to see the sheets of G-H as they were going through the press. Thus he was able to see Tyndale's translation of the Sarum lesson for St Catherine's day, and certain other changes which Tyndale had made, and incorporate them into his own version before they had been issued to the world as Tyndale's.

All this is supposition based on Mozley's estimate of Tyndale's character. With that estimate it is impossible to disagree. But the present writer finds it difficult to believe that Joye would have been able to perpetrate a rascality of this sort even if he would not have scrupled to do so. It seems most unlikely that Joye would have been able to examine the sheets of G-H as they went through the press. Certainly Tyndale and his assistants were in no mood to cooperate with Joye. It seems equally unlikely that Joye would have been given access to the sheets through collusion with the printers. To be sure, some of Joye's earlier work had been printed by Martin de Keyser, the printer of G-H. But by 1535 Joye's association with the Endhoven printing establishment was well known, and in this matter of printing English Testaments De Keyser and Endhoven were business competitors.

If we are unwilling to believe that in this small matter Tyndale would have condescended to follow Joye, a third possibility suggests itself. It is simply that Tyndale, with many irons in the fire, was preoccupied with the revisions he was making in the T34 text of the New Testament itself, and that he entrusted the peripheral task of revising the lessons from the Old Testament to his assistants. We know that he had at least two, one of whom may have been John Rogers.[3] If the assistants were less fiercely independent than Tyndale, and if their scholarly attainments were inferior to his, it is at least conceivable that they took the shortest and easiest way and embodied some of Joye's revisions and his rendering of the St Catherine's day lesson in the G-H text. As for the argument that the style of the latter is more like Tyndale's than Joye's, I must confess that my own ear, admittedly less closely attuned than Dr Mozley's to the language of Tyndale, detects nothing that persuades me that it could not have been the work of George Joye.

The puzzle is insolvable. We must be content to describe the differences between Tyndale's text and Joye's. When we examine Tyndale's lessons from the Old Testament, we find that in the selections from the Pentateuch (Exodus 24 : 12-18 for the Wednesday after the first Sunday in Lent; Genesis 37 : 6-22 for the Friday after the second Sunday in Lent; Exodus 20 : 12-24 for the Wednesday after the third Sunday in Lent; Numbers 20 : 2-13 for the following Friday; Leviticus 19 : 11-19 for the Wednesday after the fifth Sunday in Lent; Exodus 12 : 1-11 for Good Friday) he uses the text of his own translation of the Pentateuch which had been published in 1530. The few variations suggest that Tyndale may have been quoting his own text partly from memory, or possibly that he took this opportunity to alter a phrase here and there with which he had not been entirely satisfied. Two of the other lessons (I Kings 19 : 3-8, another lesson for the Wednesday after the first Sunday in Lent; and I Kings 17 : 17-24, for the Friday after the fourth Sunday in Lent) bear an obvious relationship to the text of the translation of I Kings in the Matthew Bible of 1537, and it will be remembered that this portion of the Matthew Bible is indubitably the work of Tyndale. Here, however, there is somewhat greater verbal difference than in the case of the lessons from the Pentateuch. It may be that the passages from I Kings represent an earlier version of the Matthew text, or again it is possible that Tyndale was working from memory. For the remaining lessons (eleven from Isaiah; five from

Ecclesiasticus; three from Ezekiel; two each from Jeremiah, Joel, and Zechariah; one each from Hosea, Malachi, the apocryphal continuation of Esther, Proverbs, Canticles, and Wisdom) Tyndale made new translations from the Hebrew or—in the case of the lessons from the Apocrypha—the Greek, although there is some evidence that, because he was hurried, he relied also on the Vulgate—e.g., the expression "fuller's herb" (Vulgate *herba*) in Malachi 3 : 2, whereas the Hebrew has "fuller's soap."

When we examine the corresponding lessons in J35, we find first of all that Joye used his own previously printed translations for the passages from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Proverbs. For the others (with the possible exception of the St Catherine's day lesson, for which he may have been primarily responsible) he follows Tyndale with varying degrees of fidelity. If we take them in order, omitting those from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Proverbs, we find that the first five differ widely from Tyndale's versions, although it seems certain that they are derivative. The next eleven follow Tyndale much more closely, but with minor variations—usually merely the change of a word—ranging from one in the lesson for the Wednesday after the fifth Sunday in Lent (Leviticus 19 : 1-2, 11-19) to thirteen in the lesson for the Friday after the fourth Sunday in Lent (I Kings 17 : 17-24). The remaining nine again vary strikingly from Tyndale. We can almost imagine George Joye, armed with his Vulgate and scrutinizing Tyndale's renderings with jaundiced eye, beginning with the intention of revising Tyndale wherever possible, then after a day or so growing weary and copying Tyndale with only the alteration of a word here and there, and finally recovering sufficient vigor and enthusiasm—perhaps "malice" would be a better word—to revise drastically in the remainder.

By way of illustration, here is a passage in which Joye differs so strikingly from Tyndale that the variations can best be seen by putting the two versions side by side. It is the lesson for St Matthias' day and also for St Luke's day (Ezekiel 1 : 10-14):

Tyndale: The symylitude of the faces of the foure
Joye: And this is the similitude of the cou*n*tenance of these .iiij.

Tyndale: beastes: the face of a man and the face of a lyon on the
Joye: beastis. The face of a ma*n*/ and the face of a lyon was one [*sic*] the

Tyndale: ryght hand of the foure of them. And the face of
Joye: right side of these .iiij. beastis. And the face of an oxe/ and of

Tyndale: an egle was aboue them foure.
Joye: an egle was on the lefte syde of these iiij. beastis/ for eue*n*

Tyndale: And their faces and their wynges
Joye: so was their faces ordered. But their winges

Tyndale: stretched oute aboue an [*sic*] hie. Eche had two wynges
Joye: were stretched forth ouer the*m*/ eche face hauing their two wingis

Tyndale: coupled together and two that couered their bodyes.
Joye: closse unto them/ a*n*d also two wingis couering the bodyes of the

Tyndale:
Joye: beastis. And towerd what cooste so euer they did set forthe their

Tyndale: And they went all strayght forwarde. And whether they
Joye: faces to go/ they walked forthright going whother so euer the

Tyndale: had lust to go thether they went/ and turned not backe agayne
Joye: spirit blewe them to go/ neuer turning bak their faces

Tyndale: in their goynge. And the symylytude of the bestes
Joye: in their journeye. And the similitude off these beastis

Tyndale: and the fassyon of them was as burnyng coles
Joye: as touching their eyes a*n*d their sight was lyke fyery coles

Tyndale: of fyer and as fyer brandes/
Joye: sparkeling as the beames of a burning lau*m*pe/ which fyer

Tyndale: walkynge betwene the beastes. And the fyer dyd shyne/
Joye: we*n*t emong the middis of the beastis For sich was the brightnes

Tyndale: and oute of the fyer proceaded lyghtenynge.
Joye: of the fyer oute of whiche their was lightening smitten forthe.

Tyndale: And the beastes ranne and returned after the fassyon of lyghtenynge.
Joye: But these beastis ranne and went lyke lygh teninge.

Tyndale's version is closer to the Hebrew in most respects, Joye's to the Vulgate. Tyndale's is spare, even to the omission of a phrase. Joye's is prolix and periphrastic. Neither is remarkable for accuracy or literary effectiveness. Understandably, Ezekiel's vision seems to have been a little baffling to both translators.

It will be observed, nevertheless, that Joye's version repairs several defects in Tyndale's. The latter part of verse 10 and the beginning of verse 11 is a good example. The King James version of these clauses is an exact rendering of the Hebrew: "they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle." But the Vulgate reads: "… facies autem bovis a sinistris ipsorum quatour, et facies aquilae desuper ipsorum quatuor." It will be apparent that Tyndale allowed the first of these clauses to drop out and depended on the Vulgate for the second, where the phrase "aboue them foure" has no basis in the Hebrew but is quite close to the Vulgate. In the Hebrew verse 11 begins, "Thus were their faces," but this is not in the Vulgate and it is not in Tyndale. All of this is straightened out in Joye's rendering—"And the face of an oxe/ and of an egle was on the lefte syde of these iiij. beastis/ for eue*n* so was their faces ordered"—which, surprisingly enough, is therefore closer to the Hebrew than Tynedale's. Interestingly enough, Tyndale's G-H edition corrects the defects of verse 10 to read, "And the face of an oxe and the face of an egle on the lyfte hand of the foure of them." But the deficiency in verse 11 is not repaired.

Some variations between Tyndale and Joye in other lessons may be cited; in some cases Joye corrects very small errors; in others he restores important omissions. (1) In Exodus 20 : 17 Tyndale's "thy neyboures *wyfes* is corrected by Joye to *wyfe* (corrected also in G-H). (2) In Amos 9 : 15, Tyndale's "And I will plant them *their Awne land*" is changed to read correctly *upon their owne lande* (corrected also in G-H). (3) In Ezekiel 36 : 24, Tyndale's "and will brynge you *oute of* youre Awne contre" is corrected to *unto youre owne countre* (corrected also in G-H). (4) In Exekiel 18 : 20, Tyndale's unidiomatic "The soule that sinneth/ *she shall dye*" is improved to read *the same shall dye* (unchanged in G-H). (5) The next sentence in the same verse begins, "The sonne shall not beare parte of the fathers wyckedness," but Tyndale omits the parallel clause which follows. It is restored in Joye—"nether shal the father beare the wickednes of the sonne" (uncorrected in G-H). (6) Again in Ezekiel 18 : 25, Tyndale has, "Is not my waye equall?" but he omits the parallel clause which follows. In Joye's text it is restored—" ... and are not your wayes rather unegal?" (corrected also in G-H).

In the gradual evolution of the text of the English Bible these "Epistles" of George Joye could have had little influence. Neither, for that matter, could Tyndale's. But it is a fact worth noting that two or three of Joye's renderings do indeed point the way to the readings of the King James version.[4] In Genesis 37 : 18, Joye changed Tyndale's "they contryved to sle him" to "they co*n*spyred hys dethe," and *conspired* is the verb which the King James translators adopted—"they conspired against him, to slay him." So also in Canticles 2. In verse 1, Tyndale reads: "I am the floure of y*e* felde." Joye, no doubt influenced by Luther's version,[5] reads: "I am the flower of Saron." The King James has, "I am the rose of Sharon." In verse 4, Tyndale has "... and his behauer to mewarde was louely." Joye reads, "... and spred the baner of his loue ouer mee." In this case the Cranmer Bible of 1540 took up Joye's wording and passed it on to the Authorized Version in the form, "and his banner over me was love."

Thus concludes our examination of the two editions of George Joye's "revision" of Tyndale's English New Testament. The number of pages here devoted to them is greatly in excess of their intrinsic importance in the history of the English Bible. In most instances where Joye challenged Tyndale's readings, the opinion of later scholarship has vindicated Tyndale's accuracy, judgment, and taste. So it is that relatively few of Joye's readings have found their way into the Authorized Version.

The same has been said of his translations from the Old Testament, which were considered in earlier chapters. But for those translations Joye justly claims recognition as a pioneer—as the first to bring into print English translations of significant portions of the Old Testament. No such claim can be made for his work on the New Testament. Here the chief interest lies elsewhere. It lies in its revelation of the personal relationship between a number of the early champions of the English reformation and of the diversity of opinion which sometimes did disservice to their common objectives. To some extent its interest may rest in the revelation that intensity of feeling concerning theological matters led some of them into what must appear to us as envy, malice, and all uncharitableness. But chiefly this account of Joye's revision of Tyndale's work and the ensuing quarrel may serve to remind us once again of the energy and the single-minded devotion which these men, Joye no less than Tyndale, gave to the all-important task of bringing the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular to the people of England, the homeland from which they had exiled themselves that they might be free to get on with the work to which their lives were dedicated.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10

[1] The use of Sarum can be most conveniently studied in Frederick E. Warren, *The Sarum Missal in English.* This is a translation of the folio edition of 1526.

[2] *Coverdale and His Bibles*, pp. 50-53.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[4] These points were first noted by Butterworth in *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible*, pp. 85-86.

[5] Mozley, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

11

Return to England (1535-1540)

While Tyndale and Joye were at work on their New Testaments and incidentally engaging in acrimonious controversy, developments in England must have encouraged them to hope for a prolongation of that "space to breathe a little" of which Joye had spoken so wistfully. Following Parliament's enactment, in November 1534, of the statute which unconditionally established the sovereign as "supreme head" of the Church in England, Convocation had once more taken its courage in its hands and requested royal authorization for an English version of the Bible. On January 21, 1535, Thomas Cromwell, a friend of the reformers so far as their views served to promote his own political ambitions, was appointed the King's Vicar-General for ecclesiastical matters. The little group of London printers of whom we have heard in Chapter 8 became active in publishing volumes which, while not pronouncedly Lutheran in tone, were yet more favorable to the "new learning" than to the old. To the English exiles for religion it must have appeared that their dearest hope for the reform of religion was on the point of realization.

If Tyndale and the other English reformers in Antwerp breathed more easily, their new hopes and plans were quickly shattered by the activities of a newcomer on the scene. This was Henry Phillips, a young Englishman of good family and education, who in the spring of 1535 arrived in Antwerp with the secret intention of betraying Tyndale, Joye, and Dr Barnes (he evidently regarded these three as the leaders of the protestant group at Antwerp) into the hands of the authorities. His mission coincided with, perhaps was connected with, an outburst of zeal on the part of the ecclesiatical authorities to extirpate heresy in Brabant. Phillips' motives are obscure. It is unlikely that he was inspired by a deep personal regard for the old religion. He had been recently in disgrace at home over money matters, and the best guess is that he was the paid agent of one or more of the reactionary English bishops. Certainly he was not acting for either the King or Cromwell, for shortly after he began his activities at Antwerp he was mentioned in official dispatches as an enemy of the state.

We first get wind of Phillips' plot from a letter written from Antwerp on May 1, 1535, by George Collins, a mercer, to a fellow-mercer in London.[1] According to Collins, the Procurator-General of Brabant had commissions to take three Englishmen, one of whom was Dr Barnes. Collins did not know the names of the other two, but from subsequent events it is clear that they were William Tyndale and George Joye. How, in the immediate sequel, Phillips gained the confidence of Tyndale and then betrayed him into the hands of the Procurator's officers, is one of Foxe the martyrologist's most dramatic narratives. Tyndale's long imprisonment at Vilvorde began on May 21, 1535; his ordeal ended more than sixteen months later, when, condemned as a heretic, he went to the stake praying that the Lord might open the King of England's eyes.

Dr Barnes, the second of Phillips' intended victims, was in no immediate danger, for he was back in England, safely beyond the reach of the Procurator-General of Brabant. With George Joye it was otherwise. We may guess that he too, like Tyndale, was at first taken in by Phillips' apparent friendliness. But he was more fortunate than Tyndale in that Tyndale's arrest provided him with sufficient warning, and he fled from Antwerp, perhaps taking with him the wife he had married, and made his way to Calais, where we hear of him in the early part of June.

Joye's flight, following so hard upon his recent quarrel with Tyndale, aroused suspicion on the part of Tyndale's friends both in Antwerp and in England, and they spread the story that Joye had collaborated with Phillips in procuring Tyndale's arrest. Fortunately, this slanderous story was denied by Phillips himself, as we know from a letter written in July 1535 by Thomas Theobald (or Tebald) to Archbishop Cranmer.[2] Theobald, a godson of Cromwell, had been sent to the Continent to keep an eye on the activities of Phillips. At Louvain Theobald struck up an acquaintance with Phillips, who talked freely. He boasted that he had done all in his power to bring about the arrest and condemnation of Tyndale and revealed that he had persuaded the Procurator to issue commissions for the arrest of Dr Barnes and George Joye also. When Theobald told him of the rumors at Antwerp and in England that Joye had been a party to his plot against Tyndale, Phillips denied it flatly. He had never seen George Joye, let alone taken him into his counsel. Far from it: Joye was one of his intended victims. "This I do write," Theobald tells Cranmer, "because George Joye is greatly blamed and abused among merchants and many others, that were his friends, falsely and wrongfully."

It is to be hoped that the testimony of Phillips and Theobald somehow came to the ears of Joye's countrymen to allay their unfounded suspicions. But the suspicions themselves serve to demonstrate how deep was the anger felt by many in the circle of English reformers against Joye for what they regarded as his disloyalty to Tyndale in the recent matter of the New Testaments. As for Phillips, he reaped but small reward for his labors. We hear of him from time to time during the next few years, as he wandered from place to place on the Continent, friendless and penniless and at last attainted as a traitor to his king and country. The English government demanded his extradition, but the demand was not heeded. He disappears from the record after the summer of 1542.

Even had he not been suspected of betraying his friend, prudence demanded that Joye put himself beyond the reach of the officers of the Procurator. We do not know when he fled from Antwerp, but within three weeks of Tyndale's arrest he was in Calais. There he found refuge in the lodgings of an old acquaintance of Cambridge days, Edward

Fox, one of the more moderate and attractive of the English reformers. Fox had served his king well in the matter of the divorce and was soon to be created Bishop of Hereford. In the early summer of 1535 he was in France on a mission for the government. In Calais Joye sought him out and persuaded him to appeal to Cromwell on his behalf, especially that he might be allowed to return to England.

We have the letter in which Fox interceded for Joye.[3] After reporting to "Master Secretarie" concerning the official business which had taken him to France, Fox continues:

> It may like you also further to understande that George Joye ever sithe his com*m*yng to Calais hathe been lodged w*ith* me in my howse whom I have so enduced that I trust hereafter he woll neve*r* say any thing whiche may be contrary to any article of our faithe or unto that faithe whiche is already receaved concerning the sacrame*nt* of the Altare. And surely sith to be playne with youe I fynde hym veray co*n*formable in all poyntes whiche be in my opynion requisit for a christen man to beleve. Upon whiche his good conformyte I have promysed hym to be a meane for hy*m* unto the Kinges highnes that it may please the same to be good and graciouse Lorde unto hy*m* and not to cast hy*m* away whiche I beseche youe to set forthe unto his highnes if youe shall thinke it so requisite. And of your pleasour therin to advertise me at your convenyent leasour. And thus having no oother thing worthie advertiseme*nt* I pray god send youe as well to do as I wold my self. At Calais the iiijth of June.
>
> Your owne to com*m*aunde
> Edwarde Foxe

If Cromwell acted promptly upon Edward Fox's recommendation, Joye may have been back in England by the end of June or early in July 1535, in time to see and hear of events which would have provided him with some measure of satisfaction. On July 7 his old antagonist and Tyndale's, Sir Thomas More, was executed on Tower Hill. A little later in the month the King issued to Cromwell a commission to make a general visitation of all churches, abbeys, monasteries, and collegiate bodies in the kingdom. The work of suppression would not be completed until 1539. But a beginning was made with the smaller monasteries, and it was obvious to all informed observers that the Church was to be reconstructed on national lines. Such a reconstruction was not precisely what men like Tyndale and Joye had wanted, or looked for. But it could be taken as a sign that the King of England's blindness had been partially cured, if only by the gospel light which gleamed from the eyes of Anne Boleyn.

The four years following Joye's return to England were golden years of prosperity for the English Bible. In the summer of 1535 Myles Coverdale's Bible was in press, probably at Zurich, and James Nicolson, the Southwark printer and publisher, was arranging to import the unbound sheets into England and endeavoring to secure some measure of episcopal sanction for the translation and royal approval for its publication. The book was published in October 1535—the first English translation of the whole Bible to be printed. It was dedicated to Henry VIII, and the dedication was signed by the translator.[4] Times had indeed changed since the days when Tyndale's New Testament had to be smuggled into England and copies were impounded by the Bishop of London to be burned at Paul's Cross.

In the summer of 1537 Nicolson put out a second edition of Coverdale's Bible, this time with royal license. But the Coverdale Bible was not "authorized" in the strict sense of the word. On June 9, 1536, Convocation had once more petitioned the King for an English Bible. Archbishop Cranmer had hoped that the bishops themselves would make a translation which might be authorized, and had gone so far as to farm out the work among them. A few weeks later Cromwell issued to the clergy the famous "Royal Injunctions" of 1536, which required that before the feast of St Peter ad Vincula (August 1) of the following year, a "book of the whole Bible, "in both English and Latin, should be provided in every church of the land. The "book of the whole Bible" referred to in the Injunctions was certainly the translation on which the bishops were believed to be working. But as

Cromwell's deadline of August 1, 1537, came and went the work was still far from completed, and on August 4 Cranmer wrote to Cromwell that he despaired of its being finished before doomsday. He was therefore sending to Cromwell, with recommendation for approval, a Bible "both of a new translation and a new print ... which in my opinion is very well done."[5]

This was the version which has come to be known as the Matthew Bible. The text was a composite made from Tyndale's translation of the Pentateuch, his hitherto unpublished translation of the Old Testament books from Joshua through II Chronicles, Coverdale's translation of the remaining books of the Old Testament and Old Testament Apocrypha, and Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. The book had been put together under the editorial supervision of "Thomas Matthew," a pseudonym for John Rogers, and printed at Antwerp at the cost of Edward Whitchurch and Richard Grafton. It was the printed sheets of this volume which Cranmer sent to Cromwell on August 4. How Cranmer and Cromwell managed to secure the King's approval for a translation which was so largely the work of Tyndale remains a mystery. But approval was given, and in the late summer of 1537 the book was "set forth with the King's most gracious license"—the first authorized English version of the Bible. Subsequently, as is well known, the Matthew Bible was revised to a limited extent by Thomas Taverner and then, under the auspices of Cromwell, much more extensively by Myles Coverdale. Coverdale's revision of the Matthew Bible was first published in April 1939, and from its size came to be known as the "Great Bible." This is the second, and last, authorized version published during the reign of Henry VIII.

Down to 1535, no Englishman except Tyndale had been more active than George Joye in the great task of bringing the Bible to English readers. It would therefore have been most gratifying to the biographer to find him actively connected, in some capacity or other, with these earliest authorized versions of the English Bible. But of course there was no such connection. Rogers and Coverdale, both loyal friends of Tyndale, had had the editorial supervision the one of the Matthew Bible and the other of the Great Bible, and Joye by his recent conduct had alienated himself entirely from Tyndale's friends. Indeed, except for a partial translation of the Book of Daniel, of which we shall hear later, Joye's important work as a biblical scholar was now over.

What was Joye doing during the five years or so between his presumed arrival in England in the midsummer of 1535 and the beginning, probably in 1540, of his second period of exile? He had returned under Edward Fox's guarantee of theological conformity, and presumably in expectation of finding some sort of gainful employment. As it turns out, except for one small book published in September 1535, there is no record whatever of his activities during these years. Apparently he was given no ecclesiastical preferment, not even a modest living in some obscure parish. But this is not surprising, for he was certainly in England on sufferance, and neither the government nor the Church was under obligation to reward him in any way.

The probability, a guess at best, is that during part of this time he found employment in some capacity with one or more of those London printers who had earlier printed some of his books—perhaps Godfray, the printer of Joye's translations of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, or Byddell, whose printing of the Marshall primer of 1534 had incorporated some of Joye's work, and to whom, on somewhat slender evidence, the printing of his *Apology* has also been attributed.[6]

As has been pointed out, Joye had become known as a corrector at the press, for the Endhoven establishment in Antwerp, at least in connection with his revisions of Tyndale's New Testament if not before that time. There seems to have been considerable contact between the Antwerp printers of the books of the English reformers and such London printers as Godfray and Byddell. It would have been only natural for Joye, fresh from his work for the Antwerp printers, to seek employment with their London counterparts, and for them to have taken on so zealous a worker in the vineyard who needed a means of livelihood.

All this is the merest supposition. An examination of the books put out by Godfray, Byddell, and other printers of books related in one way or another to the theological issues of the period yields no evidence whatever that Joye was so employed. As a matter of fact, the only record of Joye's activity between 1535 and 1540 is a little translation of his which was published by Byddell in September 1535. The date of the book follows so hard upon Joye's supposed arrival in England that we must suppose that Joye had made the translation while still on the Continent.

The original of this work was a little Latin treatise published by Johannes Grapheus at Antwerp in 1533 under the following title:

> Summa totius sacrae scripturae, Bibliorum veteris & noui testamenti. Item Praecepta Dei per Moysen data & a Christo interpretata.[7]

In Joye's translation (*S.T.C.* 14821) this becomes:

> A compendy- | ouse Somme of the very Chri | sten relygyon: | gathered faythfully | out of holy scripture: necessary | for all them that rede the | olde and new Te- | stament. | ¶ Thys is my derely beloued sonne/ | for whose sake onely I am apeased: | hym se that ye heare and obaye [followed by a long list of biblical citations]
>
> ¶ Tra*n*slated by George Joye | the yere of our lorde. M.D. xxxv. In Septembre.

The colophon reads:

> ¶ Imprynted at London in | Fletestrete by John Byddell | dwellyng at the sygne of the | Sonne. In M.D. & xxxv. |
>
> ¶ Cum Priuilegio Regali.

The formidable title of this work is misleading, for the translation, like the original, is a small octavo consisting of only twelve leaves.[8] Brief as it is, the book is an excellent elementary exposition of the theological position of the reformers. After brief statements concerning God the Creator, original sin, and the law which was given that men might know what sin is and that they are all sinners (since no man can perfectly obey the law), it proceeds to somewhat fuller statements concerning Christ the Redeemer and the doctrine of justification by faith. The latter is presented more moderately than Joye himself might have wished, but he was being cautious and did not go beyond his original. The following passage, touching upon the troublesome question of the relationship between faith and works, is fairly representative of the tone of the book as a whole:

> For fayth is the gyft of God/whereby we beleue Chryst to haue had [*sic*] comen in to thys world to saue the synners /which fayth is of much power & of so grete effycacy th*at* who so haue it/they wyll couet & desyre to do & performe accordynge to y*e* ensample of Christ all the offyces and dedys of charyte. For fayth once receyued/God geueth hys holy spirit/by whom co*n*seygneth and marketh all that beleue/whiche spirit is the pledge & (as ye wold say) the ernest peny certifying us to possede that lyfe eternall ...

When we come, as we shall in the next chapter, to a review of Joye's later writings on the doctrine of justification, we shall perhaps find ourselves wishing that he had been able to retain the moderation of opinion and utterance which mark the *Compendyous Somme*.

On May 19, 1536, Anne Boleyn, having been found guilty of highly specious charges of adultery, was executed as a traitor. If the devotees of the reformed religion had been able to read the omens correctly, they might have perceived in this unhappy event the onset of the King's reaction against their cause. But Henry's marriage to Jane Seymour only a few days after Anne's death quieted any apprehensions they may have felt, for Jane was the daughter of a house known to be sympathetic to the reformers. Moreover, the "Articles Devised by the King's Highness Majesty to Stablish Christian Quietness and Unity", commonly called the "Ten Articles" and promulgated by Convocation at the King's behest on July 11, 1536, was a formulary which on the whole seemed favorable to the reformers. But the Ten Articles survived as the official formulary of the English Church for only a year. It was superseded, in July 1537, by the "Bishops' Book," more properly known as *The Institution of a Christian Man*, which set forth principles more distinctly Catholic than those of the Ten Articles and was generally regarded by the reformers as setback for their cause.

In the meantime, the death of Queen Jane in October 1537 had removed whatever influence towards Protestantism she had exerted upon her husband. The suppression of the smaller religious houses was completed and the suppression of the larger monasteries was well under way. With the confiscation of all monastic property finally assured, Henry's need for the support of the reformers was at an end, and he was now free to impose upon the English Church the deeply held opinions from which he had deviated only so far as political expediency had required. Accordingly, with the able support of the Duke of Norfolk and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Henry succeeded, in the spring of 1539, in forcing through Parliament "An Act Abolishing Diversity of Opinions," commonly called the "Six Articles." Among the reformers, it was generally alluded to as the "Whip with the six strings." The law affirmed that in the Sacrament of the altar the natural body and blood of Christ are really present under the forms of bread and wine, and that after the consecration no substance of bread or wine remains; that communion in both kinds is not necessary; that priests may not marry; that vows of chastity or widowhood must be kept; that private masses must be continued; that auricular confession is expedient and necessary. Embodied in the act were penal clauses of exceptional severity. Anyone who denied transubstantiation was to be declared a heretic and burnt. First offenders against the other five articles were to be punished with imprisonment and forfeiture of property, second offenders by death. Married priests were required to put away their wives.

Fortunately, these fierce penalties were never put into full effect. Nevertheless, the Catholic reaction, as it has been called, had set in strongly. With the fall and execution of Thomas Cromwell in July

1540, and the rise to power of Stephen Gardiner, the reformers who in 1535 had come back to England from exile on the Continent were clearly in jeopardy. Especially dangerous was the situation of those priests who had married and, from principle as well as family loyalty, were unwilling to put away their wives. Chief among these were Myles Coverdale and George Joye. Short of martyrdom, flight was the only course open to them. They may have gone underground and remained in England for a few months or a year after the enactment of the Six Articles. There is some reason to believe that Joye was still in England when his old friend Robert Barnes and two others went to martyrs' deaths at Smithfield on July 30, 1540. But Joye and Coverdale and the others must have fled from England immediately after this tragic event. Joye's second exile was to last a full seven years, during which time he turned out a succession of controversial tracts which, while of little literary or theological importance, are remarkably indicative of the mind of their author and the temper of the age.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11

[1] *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, Vol. VIII, No. 862.

[2] *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 1151.

[3] P. R. O., S. P.1/ 93, fol 20. Also, *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, Vol. VIII, No. 823.

[4] Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles*, pp. 74-77.

[5] Pollard, *Records of the English Bible*, pp. 214-222.

[6] See above, p. 174-175.

[7] Nijhoff and Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliographie*, II, 703 (No. 1970).

[8] Collation: 8°, A-B4. Title page, A 1. Text, A 1^v-$B4^v$. Colophon, $B4^v$.

12

Joye and the Bishop of Winchester

George Joye's second exile began with his return to the Continent, probably in the latter half of 1540. It continued until 1547, when the tide of English Protestantism set in once again with the accession of Edward VI. Unfortunately for the biographer, the record of these seven years is a blank except for the appearance of Joye's name on the title pages of half a dozen books and his probable authorship of three or four others.

From these books a few hints concerning Joye's life during this period can be gleaned. The bitterness of his allusions to the provision of the Six Articles forbidding the marriage of priests suggests that his family situation added grievously to his difficulties. In 1543 his wife bore him a son, likewise called George. There is no record of any other children, although (according to Sir Thomas More) Joye had been married at least twelve years earlier. It is possible that the wife to whom More referred had died, and that George the younger was the child of a second marriage.[1] During most of his second exile Joye must have lived in or near Antwerp, for it was in Antwerp that most of his books written between 1540 and 1547 were published, whatever fictitious imprint may appear on their title pages. But the religious climate of Antwerp was not now as kindly for heretics, especially for married priests, as it had been a few years earlier, and during the latter part of his second exile Joye was in flight from the ecclesiastical authorities in Brabant.

This intensification of his troubles Joye attributed to Bishop Gardiner, who in the autumn of 1545 was in Antwerp on a mission to the Empereror Charles V.[2] While there, said Joye, Gardiner "fiercelye hunted for us & our bokes and resisted oure laboures with so greuous inhibicions co*n*dempnacions banishmentes and burninges."[3] To Gardiner's charge that he was a "runner about" Joye's reply is sharply plaintive:

> Ye call me a runner about, and [say that I] dare not appere euery where. I am so i*n* dede, but for no offences committed agenste god and my prince ne agaynste any other, which is my counforte in an upright conscience before god and his holy chirche. I am by you drouen out of my natyue lande from my frendes to wander and trauell in a strange contrye, the more is my heuiness and sorowe and payne especially in my syknes & olde age: wherof I may thanke you & your popisshe impes persecutinge the gospell and diuisinge your ungodly and uncristen actes, inhibicions, enstructions condempnacions and articles wherby ye haue & yet make many a pore man to smarte.[4]

Joye's acquaintance with Stephen Gardiner went back to their student days. In the 1520's, when the ferment of Lutheranism began to work at Cambridge, Gardiner had shown some sympathy with the reformers as persons, although he was never much attracted to their views. He had been one of the principal engineers of the annulment of Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon, and in 1531 was rewarded with the wealthy see of Winchester. As he rose in the hierarchy and in the government, however, Gardiner settled back into his native conservatism. During the ascendancy of Cromwell in the 1530's, Gardiner's star was sometimes in the descendent. But it rose as Cromwell's set, and from 1540 until Henry VIII's death in 1547, Gardiner was certainly one of the most influential personages in the kingdom.

In the old days at Cambridge, during his trouble with the bishops, Joye must have been grateful for Gardiner's kindness toward him.[5] But Gardiner's growing conservatism made Joye increasingly distrustful. With the enactment of the Six Articles, of which Gardiner was certainly one of the principal architects, and Joye's return to exile, Joye's attitude toward the Bishop of Winchester changed to hysterical rage. From this time forward, in almost all that he wrote, Joye attacked Gardiner directly or indirectly as the principal agent of antichrist in England.

The most virulent and protracted of Joye's attacks upon Gardiner was inspired by the latter's involvement in the martyrdom of Robert Barnes on July 30, 1540. Having "chanced upon," as he says, certain articles (theological propositions) which Gardiner had urged Barnes to agree to, Joye undertook to confute Gardiner's articles in a small octavo volume (*S.T.C.* 14826) of twenty-four leaves with the title.

> ¶ George Joye | confuteth/ Winchesters | false Articles.[6]

According to the colophon, this work was printed at "Wesill in Cliefe lande" in June 1543. The date is probably correct, but the place of publication was almost certainly Antwerp.[7]

Three years later, Gardiner replied in a work almost four times the length of Joye's:

> A Decla | ration of such | true articles as George Joye | hath gone about to | confute as false.

The book was twice printed in London in 1546, by John Herford (*S.T.C.* 11588-9).[8]

To this Joye replied later in the same year with:

> The refuta- | tion of the byshop of Win | chesters derke declaration of his false articles, | once before con- | futed by George Joye: | Be not deceiued by this bys | shopes false bokes. | Heare nowe the tother parte, | and iudge truely of the | trueth. | For the veritie wyll haue the | victorye. | M.D. XLVI.

No imprint is given on the title page, and there is no colophon, but the *Short-Title Catalogue* (14827) confidently assigns it to the press of Herford of London.[9] This work runs double the length of Gardiner's; and the student's relief at the bishop's failure to reply further is heartfelt.

As background for this battle of the books, we must review the events leading up to the martyrdom of Robert Barnes. The former prior of the Cambridge house of the Austen Friars had enjoyed a career which in itself deserves more notice than it has generally received. Following his troubles with Cardinal Wolsey in 1528, he had spent a period of exile on the Continent with the other Englishmen whose extreme views on matters of religion made it expedient for them to avoid their native country. But he returned to England in 1531, and with the gradual rise to power of Thomas Cromwell achieved a surprising degree of favor with the government. During the next few years he served as a member of several missions which were designed to gain the support of German Protestantism for the policies of Henry VIII, and in 1539 he was sent into Germany to aid in the negotiations for the King's marriage to Anne of Cleves. With the annulment of that unfortunate marriage, and the onset of the so-called Catholic reaction immediately thereafter, Barnes's extreme Protestantism put him once more in jeopardy. With a mixture of courage and folly he refused to compromise with the changed situation. In the summer of 1540 he died for his opinions in the flames of Smithfield.

Gardiner, in his reply to Joye's first attack, gives a circumstantial account of his part in this unhappy business and reviews the whole history of his acquaitance with Barnes.[10] He had known Barnes, "a trymme frere Augustine, one of a mery skoffynge witte frerelike," at Cambridge, where he began to rail at the bishops and the Lord Cardinal and thus acquired a reputation with the "lower sort." Gardiner cites one instance of Barnes's objectionable preaching. A friend of Barnes had been sued for debt, and Barnes had preached from the pulpit that it was not lawful for one Christian to sue another. The Vice-Chancellor of the university ordered Barnes to recant this Anabaptist opinion, but Barnes refused to do so and the case was referred to Wolsey. Gardiner, in Wolsey's service at the time, was well disposed towards Barnes, although he shared none of his opinions. By means of a passage in St Augustine, he persuaded Barnes to recant. Later Barnes wrote that Gardiner had deceived him by citing only part of the passage from St Augustine.

After his recantation, Barnes was imprisoned and later escaped overseas. Gardiner next saw him at Hampton Court in 1535, when Barnes had returned to England under a safe-conduct. In the presence of Archbishop Cranmer, Gardiner denied that he had suppressed any part of the passage from St Augustine. He showed Barnes the whole passage, and Barnes asked his forgiveness and promised to publish an apology. But he never did.

Time passed, during which Barnes came and went freely. He was appointed to preach at Paul's Cross the first Sunday in Lent, 1540, but at the last moment Gardiner was appointed to preach instead. Gardiner's sermon included a denunciation of the "new preachers," and this offended Barnes, who was already disgruntled at having been supplanted in the pulpit. Accordingly he managed to get himself appointed to preach at the Cross the third Sunday in Lent. Using the same text as Gardiner's, he rashly proclaimed his "new" opinions and permitted himself a number of scurrilities at Gardiner's expense; whereupon Gardiner complained to the king not only of the indignity to a bishop but also of Barnes's false doctrine.

On the following Friday, in the presence of Gardiner, Dr Cox, Dr Robinson, and the Earl of Southampton, the King himself examined Barnes and gently urged him to submit to instruction. Barnes agreed, and Gardiner, putting aside the personal slurs, suggested that they "commune" together concerning matters of doctrine. This they did, in the presence of the two other divines, for the rest of that day and part of the next. Then, surprisingly, Barnes fell on his knees, asked forgiveness, and begged that Gardiner instruct him in doctrine.

So pleased was Gardiner with Barnes's profession of repentance that he offered to make Barnes a member of his episcopal household with a stipend of £40 a year. (Later, according to Gardiner, Barnes said that he had been offered a bribe of £40 a year to forswear his opinions). Barnes accepted the offer on the condition that he be permitted to bring with him some colleagues who shared his opinions; in the end he was permitted to bring one. A few days later Barnes and his "schoolfellow" arrived at the Bishop's house for instruction; it was at this time that Gardiner put to Barnes the "articles" which Joye undertook to refute. But after two days, growing weary of humility and instruction, Barnes undertook to dispute with the Bishop. Gardiner declined to debate; Barnes left the house; and Gardiner "neuer medled with hym after." But the King had required of Barnes a public retraction of the offensive Paul's Cross Sermon. If Gardiner's account of it is correct, the retraction, at St Mary Spital on the Tuesday in Easter Week, 1540, was an amazing performance. First Barnes retracted his Lutheran opinions; then he apologized to Gardiner in a manner so elaborate as to make it appear that Gardiner had demanded the apology although he had not; then, after the bidding-prayer, he reaffirmed all the opinions he had retracted at the beginning. Many of those present, including the Lord Mayor, were offended by Barnes's conduct. The case was referred to the Privy Council, along with the cases of two others, William Jerome and Thomas Garret, who had also preached objectionably. The three preachers were confined briefly in the Tower. In the end they were condemned by act of attainder in Parliament and burned at Smithfield on July 30, 1540.

Gardiner was probably stung into making this lengthy statement—it runs to about thirty-five pages—concerning his relationship with Barnes by Joye's charge, towards the end of his first attack, that Gardiner was directly responsible for Barnes's death. Said Joye:

> Dare he clayme (think ye) any parte of his iustificacion for burning of Doctor Barnis and his felows for prechinge agenst theise wikekly [*sic* for *wickedly*] armed articles? Tell us Win. didst thou burne them so cruelly of loue and not of haatred or enuy? Trwely [i.e., *truly*] loue burneth noman for preching the trweth/ charite enuyeth not. ...[11]

Gardiner was at pains to present his side of the case in such a way as to emphasize that it was the Privy Council and Parliament, not the

Bishop of Winchester, who condemned Barnes. The truth behind the facts is obscure. Certainly it is difficult to believe that Gardiner's conduct was so entirely detached and disinterested as his narrative suggests. Gardiner had been dismissed from the Privy Council in 1539, and one contemporary view held that he was dismissed because he had dared to criticize Cromwell for employing Barnes, a heretic, as an ambassador. According to this view, Gardiner, in his handling of the Barnes affair, was striking back at Cromwell.[12]

In any case, it seems certain that Barnes, in his reckless defiance of Gardiner and the King, was relying on the protection of his patron Cromwell. In this he grievously miscalculated. Cromwell's day was over and he himself stood in need of protection. But there was no protection, and Cromwell's execution on Tower Hill preceded by two days Barnes's death at Smithfield.

But Joye was not primarily interested in the politics behind the martyrdom of Barnes. It was his belief that Barnes died for preaching that faith only justifies, and his first tract, *George Joye confuteth Winchesters false articles*, is a vehement (if frequently incoherent) exposition of that doctrine and an attempt to refute Gardiner's opinions on the subject. In Joye's view, the articles, ten in number, by means of which Gardiner had undertaken to instruct Barnes, had insisted that a man, before he is justified, might by the gift of God "do well" toward the attainment of justification, and that both faith and charity are required for justification. Such views were of course abhorrent to the reformers who held the opinion that faith and faith only justifies, and Joye's bitter attack upon Gardiner was provoked less by the fact of Barnes's death than by Gardiner's opinions.

Few things are less rewarding than the details of ancient theological controversy, and I do not propose to trouble the reader with extended summaries or analyses of the arguments put forth by either Joye or Gardiner. Joye charges that Gardiner is a Pelagian, and that he confuses observance of the law with the grace of the gospel. Gardiner insists, says Joye, that "will works" as well as faith are necessary for salvation, and in this opinion he shows himself, as do all "popish lawyers," to be a bad divine, ignorant of the plain truth of Scripture. With something less than logic, Joye combines an attack upon Gardiner's incorrect opinions with an attack upon the Bishop of Winchester's worldliness:

> Now let us set up my Lorde Gardiner in his Veluets and Satyn alofte upon his mule trapped with veluet with gylden stirups and bridle & c/ with his ientle men bare head chayned with gold/ before and aftir him. Who wilnot say but there rideth a princely prelate a gloriouse Bisshop to orne [i.e., *adorn*] and honor an hole realme? See what a clenlye sorte of tall men he hathe aboute him/ what costlye liueries geueth he/ what a mayny of idle belies daily fedeth he! Hath not Winch. lo/ wherof to glory before men? is not this a ioyly iustificacion? Nowe foloweth his conclusion of himselfe saying/ ergo by the gift of god/ that is by these worldely giftes I maye do well before worldye men of fleshly iugement I be iustified before God/ yet iustifyed gloriouslye (in whiche I reioyce) before men. (a8^{v}-b1^{r})

Gardiner, of course, was deeply involved in the affairs of the government, and it was not until the close of 1545 that he was able to finish his reply to Joye. We hear of this in a letter from Gardiner to William Paget, another member of the Henry VIII's Privy Council, dated November 5, 1545. Paget had sent Gardiner a copy of Henry Brinkelow's *The lamentacion of a christian against the citie of London*, "Printed at Jericho in the land of Promes," which Brinkelow had issued in 1542 under the pseudonym "Roderigo Mors" (*S.T.C.* 3764-6). Gardiner was well aware that Mors was a fictitious name, and since throughout the work the word *joy* was capitalized, he supposed, incorrectly, that this piece of scurrility was also by George Joye, "that worketh sorrow to himself and other." To Paget, Gardiner expressed his regret that "a knave lurking in a corner, as Joye does at Antwerp," should be tolerated. He was not so much worried about the consequences of such books as Joye's and Mors's as long as the King lived, but he feared for the realm when the young who had been brought up on such stuff would come into prominence. From this we may suspect, as did Joye, that about this time Gardiner did in fact persuade the authorities in the Low Countries to take some sort of action against the English Protestant exiles.

Gardiner concludes his letter to Paget by saying that he will not reply to Roderigo Mors but that he has completed his reply to George Joye. "And although I goo not aboute to prove myself a saincte, for I have made noo such outwarde visage of hypocrise, yet it shal appere I am not utterly a devel. And if I be a devyl, I am not of that kinde of develles that he notith me of, and such other as have pleasour to have me soo spoken of." But, he adds, it is not his purpose to defend himself, but to declare those things which need declaration.[13]

Gardiner's *Declaration* is much milder than Joye's attack. For the most part the argument is stated in broadly philosophical terms, quite unlike Joye's hammering and pummelings. Of course it is only faith which justifies, says Gardiner; that is and has always been the Church's doctrine. But the dispute with Barnes had centered on the question whether charity (in the theological sense) is also a necessary condition of justification. Barnes (and of course Joye) answered in the negative. But, Gardiner contends, belief goes before justification, and hearing and learning go before belief. Hearing and learning and believing are deeds necessary for justification; they are deeds performed before justification; they are not evil. They are works of charity; faith is set to work by charity. The Fathers, St Paul, Christ Himself all say that faith and charity are both necessary for justification. But the "new" preachers, says Gardiner, with their doctrine of "faith only," have banished charity; they make charity sit idle while faith works. He reminds his readers of the ancient prayer of the Church, which not even the extreme German reformers have dared to abolish, though it refutes their teaching: "Omnipotens, sempiterne Deus, do nobis fidei, spei, et charitatis augmentum, et ut mereamur assequi quod promittis, fac nos amare quod praecipis."

An effective point in Gardiner's argument is that the reformers had confused justification with predestination. They speak, he says, as if predestination and justification were one and the same. Indeed, one of the reformers, Gerard, had preached that the saved had been justified before the foundation of the world. He might as well have said, says Gardiner, that we are glorified before we are justified. This is to deny the degrees, or stages, of God's working in time. When St Paul speaks of "calling" and "justifying" he is speaking of God's working in time; when he speaks "predestinating" and "glorifying" he is speaking of God's operation out of time. Human language cannot express the matter, for in eternity there is no time. In the Scripture, using the language of men, the Holy Ghost is forced to use the past tense to express a thing assured. When Scripture speaks of predestination it is speaking of an operation in eternity which is neither past, present, nor future. The unlearned, says Gardiner, will say that he is here entangling plain language in sophistries. But we cannot measure God's work in our words. If we could do so, God would not be God. Since our human language, our English language, cannot express the ineffable truths of God, let us be content to worship God's predestination in silence.

There is much in Gardiner's *Declaration* in support of the doctrine of free will and of man's freedom of choice. There is also a considerable defense of the sacramental system. But even though he was a competent theologian, Gardiner was even more the governor and politician, and as such he was seriously concerned with some of the practical consequences of the teachings of the reformers. Among other matters, he contends that their private interpretations of Scripture have promoted dissension. They tell the debtor that he is under no obligation to pay his debts. By abolishing holy days they encourage the master to squeeze more work out of his men. They flatter the servant by denouncing fasting. They would abolish hallowed ceremonies. They encourage wives to speak out on theological matters, and then offer compensation to husbands by saying it is lawful to have two wives. They encourage priests to marry. They would abolish priesthood and the episcopacy. Finally, they defame Gardiner, and so doing they defame the King, who is the head of the Church in England, whose unworthy servant Gardiner is. But, Gardiner concludes,

> retourne you unto God, returne to youre soueraine lordes obeysaunce, returne to be a good christen man, and an englysshe man. For what so euer our faulty workes haue ben, they nothing serue to the iustificacion of your doctrine. Let us all praye together, for mercye, mercye, mercye, nowe most necessarye unto us. ... God graunt us to knowe him, truely and according to his will, so to worshyp and honour him, in bodye and soule togither, as all contencions, debates, malice and hatred, clearely extirpate & pulled out, we maye liue here like christen men, with christen men, and englyshe men, with englysh men. ... (b5r-b5v)

Whether or not Gardiner was, as Joye charged, a Pelagian, may be a matter of opinion. There can be no doubt whatever that he was an Erastian.

In the address to the reader prefixed to his *Refutation*, Joye explains his delay in replying to Gardiner. He did not receive a copy of Gardiner's book until the Easter season of 1546. At that time he was being hunted from place to place and it was Whitsuntide before he had an opportunity to read it. Then, since any zealous Christian would be moved to reply to such a book, lest the simple and unlearned reader be deceived by its Romish doctrine, Joye had written his reply with the greatest possible speed. But then, says Joye, there was difficulty in getting the book printed, since the Emperor, probably urged thereto by Gardiner, had issued a decree that no more English books should be printed at Antwerp or elsewhere in the "nether parts of Germany." So publication was delayed, "for that the popes frendes so fiercelye hunted for us & our bokes and resisted oure laboures with so greuous inhibicions co*n*dempnacions, banishmentes and burnings. If this boke therfore seme to sharp tothed, consider in howe sharpe a tyme it was written and by whose counsel and labour then most tirannously and ungodlye so many good bokes, holy bybles, & testaments, yea & the innocent holy members of christ were burned." ([A2r-A2v])

At the outset, Joye comments sharply on Gardiner's account of the events leading to the execution of Dr Barnes. In disclaiming responsibility for Barnes's death, says Joye, Gardiner is washing his hands, like another Pontius Pilate. Or he is like the Pharisees, who said it was unlawful for them to kill any man and turned Christ over to the secular arm. Gardiner alone was offended by Barnes's preaching; Gardiner alone complained of him to the Council and the King. It is true, Joye admits, that Barnes was attainted by Parliament. But Barnes at the stake had indicated his conviction that Gardiner was the principal agent of his destruction, and Barnes knew the truth and had not lied.

The greater part of Joye's two-hundred-page volume is devoted to a wearisome reiteration and elaboration of his views on justification and to an elaborate effort to prove Gardiner's Pelagian wrongheadedness. In connection with the latter, Joye charges that Gardiner was the principal author of *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man* of 1543, commonly known as the "King's Book" to distinguish it from the "Bishops' Book" of 1537. It affirmed transubstantiation more precisely than the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book had done, and in other respects also was more Catholic than the earlier formularies. To Joye it was a book full of false and popish doctrine. Unquestionably, says Joye, it was the work of Gardiner, assisted by other reactionary bishops:

> ... a boke belyke penned of you, for it sauoureth euery where of your dampnable doctrine. And therfore fearing lest it shulde haue ben writen against, you amonge your selues haue armed it with the kinges title and autorized it with his name, being afraid to iustifye your owne bokes. And [i.e. *if*] euer there were any traiterouse touche com*m*itted agenst his maiestie, that was one, and the most ingratitude so unthankfully to abuse the ientle noble clearnes & th*e* most benigne ientlenes of so gracious a prince to you which hath promoted you out of the donghill to sit felowlike with lordes and dukes. (S2^{v}-S3^{r})

Thus in a few sentences Joye manages to condemn the King's Book, profess his admiration for the King, and make a characteristic comment upon Gardiner's arrogance and worldliness.

Toward the end of his book Joye recalls Gardiner's kindness to him at Cambridge and asserts that Gardiner has lapsed from the "truth" which he once professed:

> Ye were there once so called that ye defended the truth against this papistry which ye now maintayne. ... But ah lasse for pitie anon after th*at* yours [*sic*] so gracious a calling of god to his truth in cambridge the cardinal called you fro*m* that calling, & the world called you to promocions, and he that called christ into the top of so high an hil & shewed him al the pleasures & glory of this wretched worlde, called you up to him also, sainge, that he wolde geue you them all if ye wolde fall downe worship and serue him. And verely, ye haue worshiped him highly and done him the most highe seruice in persecutinge and writinge ayenst gods holy eternal veritie whiche ye once tasted and fauored. (M1^r-M1^v)

And he ends with a kind of prayer that God will take away the Bishop of Winchester's stony heart and create in him a new faith to proclaim and defend true religion in the noble realm of England.

Of the conservative bishops none, save possibly Bonner of London, provoked more intense antagonism in the reformers than Gardiner. In the years after 1540 Joye was not the only one to denounce him. In addition to those of Joye and Henry Brinkelow alias Roderigo Mors, strongly worded attacks issued from the pens—to name only two—of Myles Coverdale and William Turner, the latter sometime a fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and in the reign of Edward VI to be successively a prebendary of York and Dean of Wells. After Gardiner's death, the warfare was continued by John Foxe the martyrologist. His picture of Gardiner in his London house in October 1555, waiting impatiently for word that Latimer and Ridley had been burned at Oxford, and immediately upon receipt of that news being struck down by God's terrible hand, is one of Foxe's most vivid pieces of fiction. Fortunately he has the grace to add that the story is hearsay.

Of all the diatribes against Gardiner, Joye's were the most bitter, or, if you will, the most venomous. Nor were the two books considered in this chapter his first or his last words on the matter. In almost every book which he wrote from 1540 onward, whether signed or unsigned, and no matter what the subject matter, Joye lashed out directly or indirectly against the Bishop of Winchester. One suspects that if all the facts were known it would be discovered that the basis of Joye's animosity was something more personal than Gardiner's responsibility for the Six Articles and his views on justification.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12

[1] See above, p. 86, and chap. xv, note 19.

[2] See Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*, chap. 16.

[3] *Refutation*, A2ʳ.

[4] *Ibid.*, E7ᵛ-E8ʳ.

[5] See above, p. 30.

[6] Collation: 8°. a-c8. 24 leaves.

[7] This and subsequent assignments of false imprints to Antwerp presses are based upon notes communicated to me by Dr J. F. Mozley.

[8] Collation: 4°. A-Y, a-b, and two unsigned leaves. 98 leaves.

[9] Collation: [A], B-Y8, Aa-Cc8. 200 leaves.

[10] *Declaration*, A2ʳ-C2ᵛ.

[11] *George Ioye confuteth ...*, b8ᵛ-c1ʳ.

[12] Muller, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[13] The letter is calendared in *Letters and Papers ... of the Reign of Henry VIII*, XX, Part 2, No. 732. The full text is given in Muller ed., *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, pp. 159-163.

13

Later Polemics

Before entering into a fuller consideration of Joye's other polemical writings, we shall have to examine briefly the evidence for attributing to him certain volumes which were published anonymously or (if they are in fact his) pseudonymously. In earlier chapters of this study it has been seen how John Bale's list of Joye's writings is of use in establishing the canon of Joye's pioneering early work of translation from the Holy Scriptures. Included also in Bale's list are the titles of three other translations and four original works in English which until recently had not been identified.[1] It was generally assumed that these works were lost or that Bale's attributions were mistaken. The three translations are listed by Bale as *Melanchthonum de coniugio* ("Melanchthon on Marriage"); *Zwinglicum de religione* ("Zwingli on Religion"); and *ex Erasmo* ("Something of Erasmus"). The titles of the original works are given as *De coeni domini* ("On the Lord's Supper"); *Matrimonii defensionem* ("A Defense of Matrimony"); *De baptismo & eucharistia* ("On Baptism and the Eucharist"); and *De oneribus ceremoniarum* ("The Burden of Ceremonies"). We owe to the indefatigable researches of Dr J. F. Mozley the bringing forward of evidence showing that all these are extant except the "Something by Erasmus", and that all are probably the work of George Joye except "On the Lord's Supper", which is unquestionably *The Supper of the Lord* of William Tyndale.[2] Since Sir Thomas More himself was unable to make up his mind about the authorship of this work, this single mistake on Bale's part is easily understood.

Mozley identifies "Melanchthon on Marriage" with *A very godly defense defending the mariage of preistes* (*S.T.C.* 17798). The title page of this work asserts that it was translated from the Latin of Melanchthon by "lewes beuchame," and the colophon that it was printed at Lipse by Ubright Hoff. The imprint is certainly fictitious: recent studies have shown that the book was printed at Antwerp at the press of the Widow Endhoven. It is likely that the name "lewis beuchame" is equally fictitious. "Beuchame" is otherwise unknown, and the style and tone of the work is clearly that of George Joye. All things considered, the present writer is in agreement with Mozley's identification, although it is regrettable that in this case Bale did not give an "incipit"—that is, the first few words of the text—as he did with some of his other attributions.

So too with "Zwingli on Religion," which Mozley identifies with *The rekening and declaracion of the faith of Huldrik Zwingly*, 1543 (*S.T.C.* 26138 and 26139). In this case the title page names no translator, but again we are confronted with a fictitious imprint. According to the title page the work was printed at Zurich, but the bibliographical evidence is clear that the volume issued from the Endhoven press at Antwerp. As with the translation from Melanchthon, the evidence from Bale's list for assigning the work to Joye is abundantly supported by the style, not so much of the translation itself as of the translator's own addresses which precede and follow.

In the case of two of the four original works assigned by Bale to Joye and not formerly identified there can be no question of Mozley's identification. For "The Burden of Ceremonies," Bale gives the incipit *Paulus electum vas Dei*, and "Paul the chosen vessel of God" are the opening words of a little book called *Our sauior Jesus Christ hath not ouercharged his chirche with many ceremonies* published in 1543 (*S.T.C.* 14556). No author's name is given, but again, as we shall see, the thought and style are entirely characteristic of Joye. The colophon gives Zurich as the place of publication, but the evidence all points to the Endhoven press.

The other clear case is Bale's "Defense of Matrimony," for which he gives the incipit *Cum populus Dei, Israel voce*. In 1541 the Endhoven press, with the fictitious colophon "Prynted at Auryk by Jan Troost," published *The defence of the Mariage of Preistes: agenst Steuen Gardiner bisshop of Wynchester*, which begins "When the people of God called Israel." No one who has read Joye's signed attacks on Gardiner can have the least doubt that this work was written by the same pen dipped in the same pot of vitriol. Here again, however, we are faced with a pseudonym. The title page affirms that the book was "Made by James Sawtry." There is no other record whatever of "James Sawtry," but on the basis of the presence of his name on the title page of this book he is listed in the *Dictionary of National Biography* where, in what must be close to the shortest entry in that massive work, he is said to have "flourished" in 1541.

Concerning only one of Mozley's identifications of the works listed by Bale do I have any doubt. This is "On Baptism and the Eucharist," for which Bale gives the incipit *Quia constat homo ex duabus*. "For because that man consisteth of two parts" are the opening words of *A frutefull treatis of Baptyme and the Lordis Souper* (*S.T.C.* 24217). This anonymous work was published in 1541 by Widow Endhoven, with the colophon giving the fictitious imprint "At Grunning." The incipit given by Bale, and the fact that the book was printed at Antwerp, furnish strong support for Mozley's attribution of the work to Joye. On the other hand, as will appear later, the tone of the treatise is much milder than is usual with Joye in dealing with theological topics about which he had strong convictions, and the organization of the matter is much more formal.

In the discussion of these works which follows, it has seemed well to consider them topically rather than chronologically. Accordingly we shall consider first the two tracts dealing with the marriage of priests, then the three which are more strictly doctrinal in content.

George Joye, as we have seen, had suffered bitter personal hardship as a result of that provision of the Six Articles which required married priests to put away their wives on pain of death. He had been forced to go into exile, without a settled place of abode and with only the most precarious means of livelihood. It would have been quite unlike him to keep silent under such circumstances. Following Mozley, I have no doubt that "lewes beuchame's" translation of Melanchthon's defense of the marriage of the clergy and the English tract on the same subject attributed to "James Sawtry" are both the work of Joye. Both were published in August 1541, within a year or so of Joye's return to the Continent, when his feelings on the subject of sacerdotal celibacy were at fever heat.

Melanchthon's tract had been addressed to Henry VIII in 1539, shortly after Henry had refused, because of doctrinal differences, to accept the invitation to become head of the Schmalkaldic League.[3] With the title *Defensio Coniugii Sacerdotum pia et erudita, missa ad Regem Angliae, collecta a Philippo Melanthone*, it was published at "Argentine" i.e. Strassburg—in 1540. It was translated into German by Justus Jonas in 1541. The title of the English translation reads in full:

> A very godly de- | fense/ full of lerning/ defending | the mariage of Preistes/ gathered by | Philip Melanchthon/ & sent unto the | Kyng of Englond/ Henry the aight/ | tra*n*slated out of latyne into englisshe/ | by lewes beuchame: the yere of the | Lorde. M.CCCCC.XLJ. in Auguste. | Honourable is wedlok among all sta- | tes/ and it causeth the bedde to be un- | defyled. But whormongers & aduou | terers god shall condempne. Hebr. xiij. | ¶ The trweth wyll haue | the victorye.[4]

Melanchthon's argument, which runs to something over five thousand words, reviews the history of clerical celibacy and insists that it has no sanction in Scripture nor in the practice of the apostolic age. Priests should be permitted to marry in conformity to the law of nature, the teaching of Scripture, and historical practice. The opposition has argued that marriage is the concern of the civil law and that kings therefore have authority to legislate against the marriage of priests. But kings cannot legislate against the law of God.

It is the paragraphs introductory to Melanchthon's argument proper which most strongly suggest that the pen of George Joye was at work. Why do the proud prelates oppose the marriage of priests? Because they themselves wish to justify their own single state, which has enabled them to travel faster and climb higher than a married man could do, and because they do not wish to exchange their amiable concubines for shrewish wives. The answers here given are obviously unencumbered by logic; they imply that if the clergy might marry they must marry.

And why do princes support the principle of celibacy? Because

> ... if thei had wyues/ then shulde not the courtes of princes & kynges be so furnesshed withe this shorne sorte/ so many their swerde berers before & aftyr bragging at their tayles of their own coste. For siche satellicyes ar most profitable for princes/ for oute of this sorte are chosen to be iuges in their cessio*n*s and courtes spirituall to decerne carnall spirituall (I shuld saye) causes: out of this fayer flok they chose their Ambassiadours/ lyght legates wi*th*out their owne wyues. ... (A2^r-A2^v)

The companion volume to this, the work of the alleged "James Sawtry," has a title page that is entirely in the manner of Joye:

> The defense of | the Mariage of Preistes: A- | genst Steuen Gardiner bisshop of | Wynchester/ Wylliam Repse bisshop | of Norwiche/ and agenst all the bis- | shops and preistes of that false popissh secte/ with a confutacion of their un- | aduysed vowes unaduysedly diffi- | ned: whereby they haue so wy- | kedly separated them whom | God cowpled in lawfull | mariage. | Made by James Sawtry. | Thou shalt be destroyed *with* the breath | of the Lordis mouthe/ O Anti- | criste. Isaie. xi. | When God is our refugye and rok | unspekable/ fownde and felte in | our tribulacion. Psal. xlv.[5]

Although the date given in the colophon is August 1541, we are told (A5) that the tract was written "now in this year 1539," and indeed the whole tone suggests that it was composed in the white heat of immediate rage and indignation against the provision regarding celibacy of the Six Articles, and against its authors. This "devilish" provision of the Articles, says the writer, was engineered by Gardiner and William Reppes, alias Rugg, sometime abbot of St. Bennet's, Hulme, and since 1536 Bishop of Norwich. Gardiner had seemed to favor God's word before he was promoted to Wolsey's service, but now he sins wickedly against the truth. He knows that there is no support for his position in God's Word or in the writings of the Fathers.

Why do Gardiner, Repps, and the other bishops of the "popish sect" maintain this position? Because, says "Sawtry," they would rather keep mistresses than enter into the restrictions of holy matrimony, which requires that a man protect and cherish his wife in sickness and health, and assume the reponsibility and worry of rearing children. If they were married, "ful sone shuld their prwde [*sic*] combes and crownes be cutte & their ioylye pekocks tayles be plukt. ..." (B8^v). By remaining celibate, they keep their riches and dignity.

Towards the end of this diatribe there is a passage which in the mind of the present writer clinches the argument for Joye's authorship. The passage affirms that in the Parliament which enacted the Six Articles, the Duke of Norfolk supported Gardiner with the argument that if the clergy were permitted to marry they would demand such enormous dowries and marriage settlements that before long the bishops would have all the land. There is an easy way to prevent this, says Joye alias Sawtry. No daughter may marry without her parents' consent; and no father could be compelled to agree to such a marriage settlement. But there is yet another way:

> ... let no bisshop nor preist be admitted to cures & flokfedinge [this is a favorite word with Joye] but siche as haue all the condicions and qualites that Paule prescrybeth unto Timothe & Tito/ and I dare be bownde that non of siche preistes wyll marye w*ith* your daughters so lo*n*ge as your daughters be so unlernedly prowdly so nycely and lascyuiously brought up. For sich preistes ether be they maryed all redye or els seke they siche wyues as Paule there decketh and tyerethe. i. Timo. iij. and apoynteth to them/ that is to

> weit/ sober/ lerned/ modest/ shamefaced/ simple/ sadde/ chaast/ godly maydens vertuously brought up in reding and understo*n*ding trwly th*e* holy scriptures/ which wilnot disdayne to laye to their handes to wasshe/ wrynge/ spyne/ carde/ brewe bake/ to swepe the howse/ make rede hir howsbondis dyner/ wasshe the dysshes and to turne the speete/ nourse hir owne childrene with hir owne brestes/ vyset the syke sore and pore be they neuer so lothely. Wherefore excepte your daughters wyll gladly do all these thingis/ be ye sewer there wyl no siche preistes & bisshops as Paule paynteth marye with your daughters. ... (C2^{r}-C2^{v})

Whether or not any nobleman's daughter measured up to these specifications cannot now be known. But the wife of many a Rev. Mr Quiverful might well feel that Joye has here described, with depressing accuracy, the qualities and duties which in fact came to be required of the long-suffering wives of the Protestant clergy.

If both of these tracts defending the marriage of priests are in fact the work of George Joye, one a translation and the other an original, it is not difficult to guess at his reasons for hiding behind two separate pseudonyms. The subject was one about which the reformers were most vehement and the conservatives most intransigent. The King of England held stern views concerning clerical celibacy, and the law of the land was quite precise with respect to it. Both in England and in the Low Countries the ecclesiastical courts were prepared to deal strictly with married priests, especially those who had been highly articulate in defense of their married condition. All things considered, it is not to be wondered at that George Joye sought the double protection of pseudonymity.

We turn now to the three anonymous doctrinal tracts which have recently been attributed to Joye. The earliest of these is the one about which I feel the least confidence. This bears the following title:

> A frutefull trea- | tis of Baptyme and the Lor- | dis Souper/ of the use and effect of | them/ of the worthye and un- | worthy receyuers of the | Souper/ necessary to | be knowne of all | Christen men/ | which yere- |ly re- | ceyue the Sa- | crament.[6]

The colophon asserts that the book was printed "At Grunning" on April 27, 1541, but as we have seen it actually issued from the Endhoven press at Antwerp.

The book is a nicely printed octavo running to thirty-two leaves. In content it is a carefully organized, mildly stated exposition of the moderate Protestant position concerning the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. A sacrament, says the writer, is an outward or sensible sign whereby God has declared His benevolence towards man and by means of which He strengthens our faith. Since man has both a physical nature and a spiritual nature, God has left us these two sacraments, which have as their physical symbols the water, bread, and wine. The dipping into the water, the breaking of the bread, the "forth pouring" of the wine, stir up our senses that the things promised by the words might more immediately and more deeply be conveyed into our hearts and minds.

Each of the two sacraments is analyzed in formal terms which indicate that the writer was soundly trained in the methodology of the theological schools. By way of example: In the Lord's Supper, the elements are the bread and wine; the thing signified is the body of Christ crucified and His blood shed; the words of institution are "Take, eat; this is my body" and "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26 : 26-28); the words of promise are "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6 : 54). The passage ends with a restrained denial of the Roman doctrine of the transubstantiation.

In tone the work is quite unlike any known work of Joye's. It is possible, of course, that it is a translation, and that the tone of the translation merely reflects the moderate tone of the unidentified original. But in his known translations it was Joye's custom to prefix or interpolate matter of his own expressed in his own style. In this case, since insistence upon the doctrine of transubstantiation was one of the points in the hated Six Articles, it is difficult to believe that Joye would have been able to refrain from inserting characteristic comments of his own.[7]

The title page of the second of these anonymous tracts reads briefly:

> Our saui- | our Jesus Christ | hath not ouercharged his | chirche with many | ceremonies. | The Lorde shall knit up his | mynde in fewe wordes for | our rightwise making/ | euen by faith onely to be iustified. | Esaye .X. M. D. XLIIJ. in Febru.[8]

Both the title page and the text of this little volume of forty-four pages are quite in Joye's manner. As the title indicates, the argument, supported by frequent citations from Scripture and the Fathers, is as follows: Christ set forth the essentials in a few words—"Hear me, believe me, and ye shall live." It was thus that he instructed the Samaritan woman (John 5) and those who questioned him at Capernaum (John 6). He established only two sacraments—baptism and the Lord's Supper.

But the Church, with its laws and decrees and elaboration of ceremonies, has abondoned the simplicities of the apostolic age. When Peter baptized Cornelius, he

> thrusted in nothing into Cornelius of any auriculare confessio*n*/ nor of any p*ri*uate absolucio*n*/ he taught him nothinge of cases reserued to the Pope. He forgote satisfaccion indulge*n*cis pardons and popishe penaunce to be enioyned him. He deliuered him nothing of merites and celebracion of mysses or of vowes of chastite to be payd and kept. Nothing of inuocacion of sayntes/ nor worshiping of images/ he co*m*maunded him nothing concerning pilgrimages to Rome or to Hierusalem/ no mencion of matens eue*n*song lady psalters sensing candles processions nor yet of holy brede nor holy water nor ashes: but he preched him Christe playnly and in him onely he shewed him all thi*n*gis. (B3^{v}-B4^{r})

No, the writer (Joye, as I believe) continues, Christ did not "onerate" his church with many ceremonies. His chief points and articles are few in number—faith in Him, love of neighbor, holiness in living, the right use of the sacraments—but they are sufficient. What the church needs, the argument concludes, is fewer ceremonies and laws, and more godly and well-trained preachers and teachers, more grave and reverend elders to supervise the faithful, more Christian magistrates to administer the laws.

The last of these anonymous works to be considered is the translation of Zwingli's *Christianae Fidei Expositio*, which the Swiss reformer had addressed to the Emperor Charles V at Augsburg in July 1530, and which was published just after Zwingli's death in 1531. The title page of the English translation tells something of the history of Zwingli's treatise:

> ¶ The Rekening and de- | claracion of the faith and beleif of Huldrik | Zwingly/ bischoppe of Zijryk the cheif | town of Heluetia/ sent to Charles .V. that | nowe is Emprowr of Rome: holdinge a | Perlemente or Cownsaill at Aus- | brough with the cheif Lordis & lerned men of Germanye. | The yere of owr Lorde | M. D. xxx. In the | monethe of | Julye. | ... ¶ Translated & Imprynted at | Zijryk in Marche Anno | Do. M.D.XLIIJ.[9]

If proof be needed that this volume is indeed the translation of Zwingli attributed to Joye by Bale, it may perhaps be found in "The complayninge Prayer of the pore persecuted maryed Preistis with their wyues & childern chased owte of Englond into sondry places of Germanye" appended to Zwingli's work by the translator

> ... thy aflicte lytle flok ar chased and scatred abrode by the wealy [*sic*] pride of the ungodlye ... the blasphemous theues whiche robbe the lytle fearfull flok and blaspheme thy name ar praysed and exalted of men. ... [We are] tossed and hunted from place to place/ chased from cite to cite into unknowne countryes emonge chorlysshe and fyerce barbarous peple. ... ye bitterly commanded all the Englisshe hostis in Anwerpe/ in no wyse to suffer us to come into their howses for anye releif and socour. (D6-D8, *passim.*)

Here certainly is Joye's familiar complaint against the Six Articles; in view of the specific reference to Antwerp, there can be little doubt that the antecedent of *ye* in the last sentence quoted above is Bishop Gardiner.

Zwingli's *Christianae Fidei Expositio* is so well-known that no extended summary will be given here. In the preface he complains that Charles at Augsburg has heard the arguments and confessions of other reforming groups but has not asked for the opinions of the Swiss. Since he hears that the Diet of Augsburg is about to be adjourned, Zwingli has on his own initiative prepared this statement of his beliefs for the Emperor. Under twelve heads he expounds the characteristic Zwinglian views, more radical than Luther's, on such basic matters as election and predestination, the nature of the sacraments, especially the commemorative nature of the Holy Communion, the function of the preaching as against the priestly office, and so on. He ends with an exhortation to the Emperor and all Christian princes to serve the truth and put down the superstitions of Rome.

The tone of Zwingli's treatise, except for an occasional shot at Rome and even stronger blasts against the Anabaptists, is mild and reflective rather than vituperative or cantankerous. On the whole, Joye preserves this tone in his translation. In the "Preface of the translatour unto the reader," however, he is more nearly himself.

When he realized, he says, that this work, which had never been successfully challenged, had not been translated into English, he decided to make it available to Englishmen with no knowledge of tongues. It was especially important to do so, since in England there had been much diversity of teaching and new articles of religion were promulgated almost daily. Not so long before, it had been heresy and treason to have the Scriptures in English. Now, God be thanked, the whole Bible had been printed and could be read by lay folk. But, Joye continues, those who had made it heresy to translate or read the Bible, and had burnt many a godly person for so doing, had never openly retracted their former views nor repented their persecutions.

In Zwingli's work, says Joye, the reader will be taught true Christian doctrine. The Pope was outraged by the treatise, but neither "his furious dronke*n* champion Eccius/ nor yet his sleckishe slowe beste Cocleus derst not once moue penne age*n*ste the maiestie of Zwinglye his moste eloquent heroyicall style/ rare erudicion/ and moste excellent diuine lerning. ..." (A3^v). Zwingli had been killed, his body drawn, quartered, and burned. But his heart was found unburned in the ashes.

In 1548, Joye's translation of Zwingli's *Expositio* was reprinted in London. (*S.T.C.* 26139). The title page still carries the fictitious statement "Imprynted at Zijrick," but the colophon reads "Imprynted by me Rycharde wyer." Wyer, one of three London printers who bore that surname, was a minor printer and stationer with a shop in St Paul's Churchyard. The contents are identical with the edition of 1543. In 1555, another translation of the *Expositio* was published at Geneva (*S.T.C.* 26140). This was the work of Thomas Cotsforde, an English Protestant who had fled to the Continent in the reign of the Catholic Queen Mary Tudor. In the preface to this work occurs an interesting little footnote to the history of Joye's translation. Cotsforde had finished all but a page of his translation, he says, when someone showed him a copy of the older translation. He had about decided not to publish his work when another person assured him that only a few copies of the old translation had been printed and of these many had been "lost." Unfortunately Cotsforde does not tell us how the books had been "lost." If he was referring to the edition of 1543, it is a good guess that some of the copies had been impounded by the authorities and destroyed.

It will be appropriate to conclude this chapter with a brief account of two little polemical tracts written by Joye during the period of his second exile and published in one case under his own name and in the other under his initials and clearly identifiable as his.

The first is a small octavo (*S.T.C.* 14830) of only twenty leaves with a blessedly short title:

> The unite | and Scisme of the | olde Chirche. | Blessed ar the atonmakers | studyinge for peace/ for | thei ar the childern | of God. Ma- | thew .v. M. D. XLIII. In June.[10]

The colophon reads: "Thus endeth this lytle Boke gathered by George Joye." No printer's name or place of publication is given, but the typographical evidence again suggests the Endhoven press at Antwerp.

The "old church" is the religion of Israel. Somewhat incoherently, and with occasional descents into scurrility, Joye traces a comparison between the religious history of the Jews and the history of the Christian Church. There was purity and unity of worship, he argues, in the days of the Judges and the first three kings of Israel. False religion and schism began in the reign of Jeroboam. For a time after the fall of Israel there was purity of religion in Judah, but the captivity brought with it corruption. Again there was purity for a while after the restoration and then again corruption through the period of the Maccabees on into the time of Christ, with the schisms represented by the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes.

So too in the history of Christianity. Again and again purity of belief and worship has been corrupted by heresy and false doctrine. Just as Israel fell before the Assyrians and Judah before the Chaldeans, so Europe will fall before the Turk unless the bishops repent and permit the teaching of the true religion of God, "which by their hipocrysy and superstición thei utterly so deformed it/ that thei made it abhominable heresye (as thei haue now done) and new lerning to be lothed & detested of all men." (A5^{r})

The last of the volumes (*S.T.C.* 14828) to be considered in this chapter probably emanated from one of the London presses, although neither printer's name nor place of publication is given. Its title page is padded out with passages of Scripture freely rendered in Joye's characteristic manner:

> A present con- | solacion for the sufferers of per | secucion for ryghtwysenes. | All that wyll lyue faithfully and pure- | ly in Chryst Jesu, shall suffer persecucio*n*. | ij. Timothe. iij. | If any will folowe me, let him renoun- | ce him selfe and take upon him his crosse | dayly and folowe me. | Luke. ix. | Blessed be they that suffer persecution | for well lyuinge and iustly doinge, spekin | ge or wrytinge: for theirs is the kingedo- | me of heuen. |

> Matth. v. | Verely I saye unto you. That easier | shall it be to the londe of the Sodomytes | and Gomorreans in the day of iudgement | then to that londe and cite, which nowe | thrust awaye the gospell and preachers, | offred and sent unto them. | Matt. x.

The colophon reads, "1544 in September. G.I.[11]"

The body of the work begins with an account of the ages in which the true Church, both Jewish and Christian, and the true preachers have suffered persecution. In the end the truth has always prevailed and it will prevail against the present persecutions. The five consolations, developed by Joye at some length, are these: that Christ Himself also suffered; that He is always present with the faithful; the cause for which the faithful are suffering is God's cause; the adversaries cannot understand this just cause and cannot refute it; the reward of the faithful is life everlasting in Christ.

More interesting by far is the preface, which is a highly partisan review of recent history with enough autobiographical detail to establish Joye's authorship beyond a doubt. It begins with a summary of the efforts of Wolsey, More, and Stokesley, back in the 1520's, to suppress the English New Testament and other books of prayer out of Scripture. The reference to "other books of prayer" is especially interesting in view of Joye's activities, twenty years earlier, in connection with the earliest English Primers. Joye asserts that more than five hundred Testaments and other books in English were burned at Paul's Cross, while Bishop Fisher and others preached in defense of the old religion. Joye repeats the story of his old troubles with John Ashwell the prior of Newnham, Langland of Lincoln, West of Ely, and Sir William Gascoigne, and laments anew the fact that he had been deprived of his fellowship at Peterhouse, which was a perpetual living. If they had caught him, he says, they would have burnt him for preaching against pilgrimages, for affirming that faith only justifies, and for defending the marriage of the clergy.

But, Joye asks in conclusion, where now are those who conspired against the Bible in English and burnt the Testaments at Paul's Cross?

Where are Cardinal Wolsey and Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More? Where are Stokesley of London, West of Ely, Fox of Hereford? With an assurance that can only amaze a modern reader, Joye tells us quite precisely where they are.

One is astonished and grieved to find the name of Edward Fox in this gallery of the damned—Fox, himself a moderate reformer, who in 1535 had interceded with Cromwell that Joye might be allowed to return to England,[12] and who had died in 1538. We can only suppose that he had presumed to disagree with Joye on some point, such as the marriage of priests, which Joye held vital. Joye could never forgive those whose views on such matters differed from his, and he was confident that his judgment and Heaven's would coincide.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 13

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] *Coverdale and His Bibles*, pp. 340-342; "Tyndale's *Supper of the Lord*," *Notes and Queries*, CLXXXIII (1942), 305-306; "George Joye, or Gee," *ibid.*, CLXXXV (1943), 252-253.

[3] Reprinted in *Philippi Melanthonis Opera*, XXIII, 669-691. For the historical background of the tract, see Henry C. Lea, *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*, pp. 464 ff.

[4] Collation: 8°. A-D8. 32 leaves.

[5] Collation: 8°. A-D5^r. 29 leaves.

[6] Collation: 8°. A-D8. 32 leaves.

[7] The translator quotes from Isaiah in several instances, and I had hoped that a comparison of these passages with Joye's translation of Isaiah might be helpful in deciding Joye's claim to this tract. But the resemblances and the dissimilarities cancel each other.

[8] Collation: 8°. A-C6.

[9] Collation: 8°. A-D8. 32 leaves.

[10] Collation: 8°. A-C4. 20 leaves.

[11] Collation: 8°. A-G8. 56 leaves.

[12] See above, pp. 195-196.

14

Daniel the Prophet

DURING his second period of exile, in despair over the state of religion in England and the low ebb of his own fortunes, George Joye seems to have meditated much upon those apocalyptic books of the Bible which, according to interpretations then generally accepted, foretold that the Last Day would not be long delayed. Especially he seems to have studied the Old Testament Book of Daniel and several recent commentaries upon it. Of the latter he was especially taken by those of Philip Melanchthon, John Oecolampadius, Conrad Pelicanus, and John Draconites, two of which had been recently published.[1] The result of this diligent study was his own "exposition of Daniel the Prophet," published in 1545. Lacking the erudition necessary for an original study of this difficult book, he simply conflated expository materials drawn from the commentators mentioned above and added a vast deal of his own sermonizing and propagandizing. The result was an octavo volume (*S.T.C.* 14823) of close to five hundred pages, by all odds Joye's longest and most tiresome book.

On the title page, Joye makes full acknowledgment of his sources:

> The exposicion of | Daniel the Prophete gathered | oute of Philip Melanchton/ Johan Eco- | lampadius/ Chonrade Pellicane & | out of Johan Draconite. &c. | By George Joye. A Pro- | phecye diligently to | be noted of al Em- | prowrs & kinges | in these laste | dayes. | And nowe ye kinges get ye understan- | ding & knowlege/ be ye taught & lerned | in Gods worde/ ye iuges of the erthe. | Psal. 2. | Serue ye the lorde in feare/ kisse ye the | sonne (and not images) lest he be wrathe | and ye perisshe from

> the way/ for shortely | shal his anger be kindled. But then bles- | sed be thei all that truste unto him. | 1545. In Auguste.[2]

The colophon reads: "Emprinted at Geneue. 1545. G.I." Here again, however, it seems likely that the place of publication was Antwerp. The fact that Joye's initials are included in the colophon has led some writers to suppose that Joye had set himself up as a printer, others that he paid the cost of publication. In view of Joye's frequent lamentations over his poverty at this period, neither supposition seems very probable.

Joye prefaces his work with a translation of Melanchthon's dedicatory epistle to Maurice Duke of Saxony. This is followed by Melanchthon's "Argument of the hole boke," with its summary statement of the theological and moral implications of the Book of Daniel, its elaborate arithmetical calculations concerning the age of the world, and its analysis of the significance of the four monarchies. The remainder of the book is a chapter by chapter commentary, drawn from the erudition of the four commentators already mentioned and the lucubrations of Joye himself.

Modern biblical scholarship is in general agreement that the Book of Daniel was written in the second century of the pre-Christian era. In this view the "prophecies" of the book are historical rather than predictive in nature, history veiled as prophecy being one of the characteristics of apocalyptic writings. Joye and his fellow commentators, however, had no doubt that the book dated from about 536 B.C., the third year of the reign of Cyrus in Babylon, to which point the professed historical narrative of the book comes down. They were especially fascinated by the prophecy of the four monarchies, and most particularly with that of the fourth of these.

It will be remembered that Daniel's visions foretold that there would be four monarchies, beginning with Nebuchadnezzar's, and then would come the Last Day. About the identification of the first two monarchies with the Babylonian and the Persian there can be no disagreement. Modern scholars identify the third with the Greek to the death of Alexander the Great in 322 B.C., and the fourth (picturesquely symbolized as the Fourth Beast with Ten Horns) with the Syro-Greek monarchy of the Seleucid dynasty to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes in the middle of the second century B.C. But to Joye and his contemporaries the third monarchy was the Greek empire to Antiochus Epiphanes, and there could be no doubt that the fourth monarchy was the Roman Empire, which was interpreted to include the later Holy Roman Empire and the Roman Catholic Church, of course with the Pope in the role of antichrist. According to Daniel, there would be no fifth monarchy. This led to the critical question, how long would the fourth monarcy endure? When could the godly preachers of the true religion expect release from tyranny and persecution?

In seeking an answer to this question the commentators on Daniel fell back upon the then generally accepted view that the life expectancy of the world was six thousand years, divided into three ages of two thousand years each. The first age was from the Creation to the time of Abraham (4000-2000 B.C.). The second age was from the time of Abraham to the coming of the Messiah. The third age thus would end with Judgment Day in A.D. 2000. But these round-number calculations had to be corrected, for Christ was born in the year 3978 from the Creation and this "prevented"—i.e., anticipated—the end of the fourth millennium by twenty-two years. "And why? verely because we shuld know that as he hathe with his firste coming into flesshe preuented the ende of the second age/ euen so will he with his laste coming to iugement preuent the ende of the last age and sixt millenarie" (folio B2). Calculations based upon Daniel's prophecy indicated that the end of the third age would be advanced by several centuries. Joye himself was of the opinion that the Last Day would come within a hundred years of the date of his writing, perhaps in as few as thirty. "But," he adds modestly, "I iuge that it is not geue*n* to any at this tyme to know this misterye concerninge the very daye and hower hyden in the nowmber/ tyll it be fulfilled" (folios h3^r^-h3^v^). He concludes:

> Nowe geue thankis to our celestial father thorowe Jesus cryste our redemer/

> that he hath at last so clerely by his prophete daniel reueled to us these so secrete misteries: so that we be assewered/ cryste our redemer to haue had ben comen & incarnated these .1545. yeres ago/ & that he shall come agene shortely to delyuer us mightely out of anticristis tyra*n*nye/ & destroye him w*ith* his almighty worde. (folio h4^{v}).

The reference to "antichrist's tyranny" in the passage just quoted serves to suggest the other principal facet of Joye's interest in Daniel—the supposed analogies between the Old Testament narrative and the state of religion in contemporary Europe. Indeed, the pointing out or, better, the invention of such analogies constitutes Joye's own chief contribution to the work. Joye found scores of opportunities for insisting in his commentary upon the doctrine that faith only justifies and for attacking the Mass, the veneration of images, the hierarchy, the advocates of clerical celibacy. Passages dealing with these matters are found throughout the work, but especially and with great vehemence in the commentary on Chapters 11 and 12, which dealt, in the opinion of Joye and his colleagues, with the kingdom of antichrist. To consider these passages in detail would be merely a wearisome repetition of the controversial topics of which we have already heard too much. But one passage may be quoted to illustrate the ingenuity with which Joye could relate his commentary on a book of the Old Testament to contemporary matters. He is drawing a lesson for his own day from the narrative, in Daniel 3, of the refusal of the Three Holy Children to fall down and worship the golden image which King Nebuchadnezzar had set up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon:

> But here myght these thre holy men haue well auoided the kynges tyrannye/ escaped the perill of theyr burnyng, and not offended theyr consciences but pleased god/ had they bene taught as some Bisshops nowe teache men. That is to knele downe and kysse ymages (as they teache vs to crepe to the crosse and kysse it) without any godly worship, not transgressing the first nor seconde commandements. Here lo they wanted oure Bisshops doctryne/ here they wanted lo/ a lytle of the examiner of the hunting of the foxes highe

> diuinite/ for aftir his doctryne thei might haue kneled downe to Nebucadnezars golden image/ yea & haue kissed his feet to/ with a certayn vtwarde reuere*nt* behauiour/ honouring god nethelesse in spirit/ so that in onely kneling and kissing (as saith th*e* reskewer and [co]uerer of the Romishe foxe) ther ca*n* be no idolatry/ ywisse daniel was greatly ouersene [i.e. *mistaken*] that he taught not his felows this glose in theirs so present a perel. (folio E2).

The reader will recognize in the "rescuer of the Romish fox" the person of Bishop Gardiner, who had recently outraged the reformers with the declaration that no idolatry was involved in showing an outward reverent behavior towards images.

For one whose chief concern in all these matters is the development of the English Bible, the principal interest in Joye's *Exposition* does not lie in the commentary itself. It rests rather in the fact that Joye includes in the commentary his own translation of about five-sixths of the book of Daniel itself. In doing so he seems to have followed the lead of Conrad Pelicanus, who included the Vulgate text of Daniel, with occasional variant readings from the Zurich Latin Bible, in his own commentary, which is of course in Latin.

In all, Joye translated 297 of the 357 verses in the book. It would appear that his first intention was to translate only selected passages. After translating eight verses of Chapter 1 he enjoins the reader:

> Because the text occupieth miche place/ therfore take the byble to the [i.e. *thee*] at this place and laye it bye the [*thee*] reding ouer the text before & after thou haste rede this exposicio*n*.

Accordingly he translates only selected passages from the next four chapters. Beginning with Chapter 6, however, he translates the text in its entirety, although the translation is so fragmented amidst the commentary that it requires a wary eye to piece it together. One may guess that Joye had two reasons for giving the full text of the last seven chapters. The most obvious is that he must have realized that not many of his readers would have had the text available, since the only English version in print at the time was Coverdale's as it was to be found in various editions of the Coverdale Bible, the Matthew Bible, or the

Great Bible—all large and expensive volumes. The second reason, which becomes evident as one reads on in the *Exposition*, is that Joye's own interest increased as he came to the more apocalyptic portions of Daniel and he translated for the sheer pleasure he derived from the task.

For the most part Joye translates from the Vulgate, but from time to time he makes use of readings from the Latin version of Zurich as he found it in Pelicanus. The style of the translation is quite characteristic, displaying the freedom of idiom, the fondness for unusual or dialectal words, the trick of using a pair of synonyms, and the general impetuosity which have been noted in Joye's earlier translations. In general he follows the sense if not the language of his original, although in Chapter 11 (the translation of which spills over into the commentary on Chapter 12) his excitement over theological matters leads him to introduce commentary into the translation in an unforgivable fashion.

A passage which shows Joye hewing fairly close to the line of his original is the account of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Chapter 4, verses 4 to 17. (The words in square brackets have been inserted by hand in the margins of the British Museum copy to replace words which have been erased or blacked out in the text. It is possible that this was Joye's own copy and that we have here an early example of author's corrections.)

> I Nebucadnezar/ happye and prosperouse in my familie/ and ryche in my palace/ did see a dreame so ferefull/ that my thoughtes in my bedde troubled my head greuously/wherfore I sent oute a commandement/that all the wyse men of Babylon shuld be brought vnto me/ to interprete my dreame. Then were there brought before me the wysemen/ the sothsayers of chaldey/ astronimers &c. Vnto whom I tolde my dreame but the interpretacion therof thei cold not tell me/ vntill at last there came daniel vnto me/ whose name is Balthasar aftir the name of my god/ which daniel hathe the spirit of the most holy god/ and vnto him I tolde my dream saynge. Balthasar cheif master of the wyse men & astronimers all/ in whom I knowe to be the spirit of the most holy god and that ther is no secrete mysterye hidde from the/ tell me my drame & what it signifieth. For this was my dreame in my bedde.

> I did see a tree vpo*n* the middis of the erthe whiche was fayer and highe. The tre was great and stronge/ so high that it reched vnto th*e* heuens/ and might be sene to the farthest partis of al the erthe/ [her] branches were fayer & lusty to beholde/ [her] frute so plentuose that it was meat sufficient for all thinges/ vnder it as it were in a plesant shadewe there dwelt the wylde beastes/ and the birdes nestled in [her] branches/ and all things lyuinge were fed of that tree. And whyle in my dreame I behelde it/ lo there came downe from heuen in great spede an holy aungell/ crying lowde and spekinge thus kutte downe the tree/ and loppe of [her] bowes/ smyte of [her] branches/ and skatere away [her] frute/ and let the beastes & birdes flye their wayes from it/ but the stok with the rotis thereof leaue still in the grownde/ with chaynes of [yron] & brasse so tyed that he may go and graze in the wylde felde and ly down vnder the dewe or rayne of the heuens/ eating the moyste grasse with the brute beastes/ and let the humane or manis reason be taken from him/ & brute beastis senses be geuen him/ vntil the course of seuen tymes be passed ouer him. And this thing was decreed by the sentence of these spedy watchers in the counsell of these holy messagers from heuen/ that al men lyuinge shuld knowe/ that th*e* most highest must so rule & raigne in the kingdom and empyre of any mortal men/ that to whom he lyste to geue it/ thei shal raigne in it/ and if he lyst/ he will lyfte vp there vnto the moste abiecte and vileste man. (folios F8^r-G1^r, *passim.*)

It may be instructive to set down a few verses of the same passage from Coverdale's translation, the only English version before Joye's, so that the reader may make a comparison not only between the translations but also between Joye's style and that of one of the acknowledged masters of prose in the sixteenth century. The following is Coverdale's rendering of verses 13-16, having to do with the cutting down of the tree and the prophecy of Nebuchadnezzar's lycanthropy:

> I sawe in my heade a vision vpon my bed: & beholde, a watcher (eue*n* an holy angel) came downe from heauen, and cryed mightely, sayenge: Hew downe the tre, breake off his braunches, shake of his leaues, and scatre his frute abrode: that all the beestes maye get them awaye from vnder him, and the foules from his braunches. Neuertheles leaue the grounde of his rote still in the earth, and bynde him vpon the playne felde, with cheynes of yron and

> stele. With the dew of heauen shall he be wet, and he shall haue his parte in the herbes of the grounde with other wylde beastes.
>
> That mans herte off his shall be taken from him, and a beastes herte shall be geuen him, till seuen yeares be come and gone vpon him.

This is not Coverdale at his best, but it illustrates his gifts of phrasing and balance, and the general restraint of his style. In contrast, Joye has little gift for the balanced phrase or the rhythm of prose. But his translation of Daniel does exhibit the exuberance and reckless vigor which characterize his earlier translations from the Old Testament. Perhaps it was these very qualities which caused later revisers to ignore his work.

Since Joye's translation of Daniel is so little known—indeed I can find no mention of it in the standard histories—it may be well to give one more specimen.[3] What follows is the translation of Chapter 12, the last in the book. It is selected partly because it illustrates the freedom of Joye's method. It will be noticed that in verse 7, in answer to Daniel's question when "these things would have an end," the "man clothed in linen" replies that they will endure "unto the determined tyme/ whether it be long or short." This is Joye's translation of the Latin of the Zurich rendering, "usque ad praefinitum tempus siue longum siue breve," which, as the parenthesis following in the text indicates in a confused way, was preferred by Draconites. Then Joye proceeds to give another rendering of the answer—these things shall endure "for a tyme/ tymes and an half"—which is the rendering of the Vulgate's "in tempus, et tempora, et dimidium temporis," and the version which at this point was preferred by Pelicanus.

> But in this tyme/ Michael the great prince standinge for thy peple shall aryse vp/ for there shalbe siche an hard heuey and troublos tyme as neuer was sence any man hath bene vnto this tyme. But in this tyme thy peple which is fownde wryten in the boke shalbe delyuered and saued. And many sleapinge in the erthe shalbe vpwakened/ some into lyfe eternal and some into euerlastinge shame and contempte. Also the techers shall shyne lyke the brightnes of the firmament. And thei *which* bringe many to the knowlege

> of the rightwysemakinge shall shyne perpetually lyke the starres. But thou (oh Daniel) shut vp these wordis and seall vp this boke vntil the laste tyme where many shall turne it ouer & be skatred abrode/ that the vnderstandinge and knowlege might be gretely encreased and multiplyed.
>
> Aftir this I daniel loked vp/ & lo/ there stode two other/ one on this syde of th*e* flowde & th*e* tother on th*e* other syde. And I sayd to the man cled with the lyne*n* vesture standinge aboue the floude. When the*n* shall there be an ende of these meruelouse thinges? And I herde him that stode in lynen aboue the waters of the floude/ which (his right and lyfte handis lyfted vp into heuen) swore by the euer lyuinge god/ that all these thinges shall haue an ende/ aftir that thei haue fully dispersed and skatered th*e* power of the faythfull peple to endure vnto the determined tyme/ whether it be long or shorte (or els as hath another text translated by doctor Joan Draconites) All these shall endure for a tyme/ tymes and an half. And the dispersion of the holy peple ended/ all these thinges shall come to passe.
>
> I herde it/ but I vnderstode it not/ wherfore I sayd: Lorde/ what/ or when is the laste ende of these thinges? And he sayd: Go thy ways daniel/ for these wordis are shut vp and sealled vp vnto th*e* last tyme. Very many in the mean tyme shalbe purged/ and made whight and blowne togyther tryed as metall in the fyer: but th*e* vngodly shall do wykedly/ nether shall all the vngodly vnderstande nor regarde these thingis/ but the wyse lerned shall regarde and teache them forth.
>
> Furthermore as touchinge the tyme wherin the perpetuall dayly sacrifice shalbe taken awaye and from the tyme of the setting vp of the abominable destruccion/ there shalbe a thousande/ two hondred/ & .XC. dayes/ Oh blessed man/ that shall tarye and see the thousande thre ho*n*dred and fyue and thirtye dayes. But daniel go thou hence vntyll the ende be comen & be at reste. For thou shalt stand vp with thy parte in the ende of the tymes. (folios g1^{r}-h4, *passim.*)

One small point in the foregoing passage will indicate the difficulties involved in tracking down the relationships among these sixteenth-century versions of Scripture. It will be noted that Chapter 12, verse 3 (the fourth sentence in Joye's text) begins "Also the teachers shall shine. ..." To those familiar with the King James Version, which reads "And they that be wise shall shine ...," this will seem to be eccentric.

But here Joye seems to be following either Zurich, which reads, "Porro doctores splendebunt," or Luther's German, "Die Lehrer aber werden leuchten." Coverdale, on the other hand, seems to have combined Luther's reading with the Vulgate reading—"Qui autem docti fuerint, fulgebunt"—to arrive at his "The wyse (such as haue taught other) ...." Coverdale's rendering was retained in the Matthew Bible and the Great Bible. But the Geneva Bible reads simply "And they that be wise," with the marginal note "Or 'such as teache and instructe others,' " and this reading is retained in the Authorized Version. It is interesting to note that the Revised Version of 1880, representing a far more advanced stage of Hebrew scholarship, conservatively retains the King James reading in the text, but gives the alternative reading *teachers* in the margin, thus in some measure vindicating the Luther-Zurich-Joye readings.

Joye's commentary on Daniel with its accompanying translation was, as far as is known, the last of his works in the field of biblical scholarship. It appears also to have been his most popular, for in 1550, five years after its first publication, it was twice reprinted in London. By that time, of course, the winds of doctrine had once again veered about in England, and the strongly Protestant tone of the book was congenial to the new men in control of the government. One of these London editions was published by John Day and William Seres (*S.T.C.* 14824), the other by Thomas Raynolde (*S.T.C.* 14825).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 14

[1] In order they are as follows: Melanchthon, *In Danielem prophetam commentarius*, 1529; Oecolampadius, *In Danielem prophetam ... libri duo*, 1530; Pelicanus, *Commentaria Bibliorum, Tomus Tertius* [contains also commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve], 1540; Draconites, *Commentarium in Danielum ex hebraeo versum*, 1544. Only Melanchthon's commentary has been reprinted in modern times (*Philippi Melanthonis Opera*, Vol. XIII, in *Corpus Reformatorum*). For Oecolampadius, see Staehelin, "Oekolampad-Bibliographie," *Basler Zeitschrift*, XVII (1918), 1–119, Nos. 163, 197, 209(6), 209(7), 216(2).

[2] Collation: 8°. A-Y8; Y [repeated], 8 leaves; Z, 8 leaves. 244 leaves.

[3] See also Appendix C.

15

Last Years (1546-1553)

In his account of events of the year 1546 John Foxe the martyrologist tells a strange story, in which the Bishop of Winchester once more plays the role of villain. Foxe had the story from Ralph Morice, Archbishop Cranmer's secretary, who in turn had it from the Archbishop himself. Early in 1546, Gardiner was abroad on an ambassadorial mission designed to strengthen Henry VIII's ties with the Emperor. Cranmer, so Morice said, took advantage of Gardiner's absence to enlist the King's support for the reform of superstition in the Church. The King agreed, even to the extent of being ready to substitute a communion service for the Mass, and ordered Cranmer to write two letters to this effect, one addressed to Cranmer himself and the other to the Archbishop of York, which the King would sign. The letters were written and dispatched to the King, but they were never signed or sent to the Archbishops, for Gardiner, somehow learning what was in the wind, wrote letters to the King saying that any such reforms would hopelessly snarl his negotiations with the Emperor. "Mark," says Foxe in a marginal note, "the mischievous fetches of this old fox Winchester."[1]

Foxe's story may be true, for the King was sickening to death and in his illness his mind may have vacillated briefly. However that may be, it is clear that the forces of conservatism prevailed, for the summer of 1546 was a period of vigorous activity against heresy and heretics. The principal victim was that determined and outspoken lady, Anne Askew, who had been repeatedly in trouble for her extreme Protestant views, particularly her denial of transubstantiation. Now she was arraigned before a commission and condemned to be burnt as a heretic. In the Tower, according to her own account, she was racked in a vain effort to force her to recant. Finally, on July 16, 1546, she was burnt at Smithfield.

Just eight days before Mistress Askew's death, a proclamation for the suppression of heretical books was issued in the King's name. In this proclamation the name of George Joye figures prominently. According to a contemporary chronicler, the proclamation was "made in the cittie of London with a trompett and an harold-at-armes, with the serjeant-at-arms of the cittie" on July 7,[2] but the proclamation itself, printed by Thomas Berthelet, is dated July 8. The title reads as follows: "A Proclamation deuised by the kinges highnes, with thaduise of his most honorable counsell, to auoide and abolish such englishe bookes, as conteine pernicious and detestable errours, and heresies, made the .viii. daye of July, the .xxxviii. yere of the kynges maiesties most gracious reigne."[3]

In a preamble, the proclamation avows that divers "lewd and evil-disposed" persons, pretending to expound the truth of Scripture, have sown abroad numerous errors and heresies which trouble the "sober, quiet, and godly" religion established in England under the King. It then orders that by the last day of August the owners of certain books must turn their copies over to the authorities for burning, with full pardon for those who turn their books in and severe penalties for those who do not. Specifically, the works forbidden are the New Testament in either Tyndale's or Coverdale's translation, and any of the works of Frith, Tyndale, Joye, Roye, Basil [i.e. Thomas Becon], Bale, Barnes, Coverdale, Turner, and Tracy. Finally, the proclamation forbids the importation, sale, or distribution in any manner of English books pertaining to religion printed abroad.

The presence of the name of George Joye in the list of authors whose works were banned by this proclamation is ample testimony that he was regarded as among the chief of those who had troubled the "sober, quiet, and godly" religion of the realm. But we have additional testimony from another source. One of the most conservative of the bishops was Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, whose later activities in the reign of Queen Mary made his name anathema to John Foxe and the other reformers. Bonner, as might have been expected, proceeded with a vigorous enforcement of the proclamation. On September 28, 1546, he sent to the Privy Council a certificate that two days earlier he had presided at a book-burning at Paul's Cross at the sermon time. To the certificate he appended a list of "suche Books prohibit as were burned." Copies of both the certificate and the list are preserved in his episcopal register.[4] In all, eighty-nine titles are listed. First come the titles of books by those writers who are named in the proclamation. Each author's titles are grouped together by a bracket, with the author's name in the margin outside the bracket. In order, there are bracketed titles by Coverdale, Joye, Becon, Tyndale, Frith, Turner, Barnes, and Bale. There follows a list of miscellaneous titles, some followed by the author's name, others not. In a number of cases, the books in this miscellaneous list are by the men whose works were bracketed in the first part of the list.[5]

The list of Joye's books, bracketed, with his name in the margin, is as follows:

> First, thexposition of Daniel the prophet gathered oute
> by Phillip Melanchton Jhon Oecolampadius Chonrade
> Pellicane and oute of Jhon Draconite, &c.
> Translated into English.
> Item Dauid Psalter tra*n*slated into English.
> Item Jeremye the Prophette, translated into English.
> Item The proverbes of Salamon translated into English.
> Item an Apology against william Tindall.
> Item a boke called the prophet Esay, translated into English.
> Item the subuersion of Mores false foundatio*n*.
> Item a present consolation for the suffereraunce of persecution
> for rightuousnesse.

Interestingly enough, one item in the list of miscellaneous titles is *The Defence of Marriage of Priests, made by James Sawtrye*, a work which, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, is almost certainly from Joye's pen. It will be noticed also that Bonner's list of condemned books does not include Joye's two signed attacks on Gardiner over the affair of Robert Barnes, although those volumes contained some of Joye's least restrained utterances upon doctrinal matters. Since the list appears to be made up of titles of volumes which were actually burned at Paul's Cross on September 26, 1546, one can only conclude that no copies of these inflammatory books had actually been impounded.

No doubt Joye, Coverdale, and the other living writers whose books were condemned and burned in the summer and autumn of 1546 saw in this melancholy event a setback to their hopes for the reform of religion in England. But at no time in the past quarter of a century could they more appropriately have said with the Psalmist that although weeping might endure for a night, joy would come in the morning. For Henry VIII died on January 20, 1547, and the nine-year-old heir to the throne was forthwith proclaimed King Edward VI. The sixteen executors of the late king's will, who were presumably to serve as a council of regency during the minority of the boy king, represented a nice balance between the Old Learning and the New. But, within a few weeks, by a brilliant *coup d'état*, Henry's will was scrapped and Edward Seymour had secured his own election as Lord Protector. Assuming the title of Duke of Somerset, he became the virtual ruler of England. And Somerset, like all the Seymours, was a friend of the reformed religion.

There is no need to repeat here in detail the story of the religious upheavals of the next six years. During the three-year regime of Somerset the changes were gradual. The Six Articles were repealed. Visitation Injunctions issued at the end of 1547 not only required that each parish have a copy of the Great Bible but also imposed upon the parishes the use of Cranmer's *Homilies* (which affirmed a mild version of the doctrine of justification by faith) and Erasmus' *Paraphrase* of the Gospels and Acts. More extreme was the provision requiring the removal of "abused" images from the churches and the suppression of certain customary ceremonies. The conservative clergy opposed the injunction concerning the *Homilies* and the *Paraphrase*; Gardiner and Bonner were both imprisoned for a time for refusing to accept them. But popular opposition centered upon the removal of images and the suppression of ceremonies, and the government was at some pains to explain its policies and to quell the riots which followed upon the removal of beloved statues from the churches and the extinguishing of the votive candles.

The year 1548 was largely given over to a kind of national argument on the topic of the Mass and related matters of doctrine and practice. In Parliament, in Convocation, in pulpit, in kitchen and tavern the debate raged. Out of it came, first, an act legalizing communion in two kinds, then an "Order of Communion" which provided for prayers in English at the Mass, and finally the first Edwardine Prayer Book, which was authorized on January 21, 1549, by the first Act of Uniformity.

In the end, Somerset was unable to cope with the popular opposition to his religious and economic program. Robert Dudley, Earl of Warwick and later Duke of Northumberland, emerged as the strong man of the government. In October 1549 he succeeded Somerset, who had been deposed by the Council, as Protector, and remained the virtual dictator of the realm until the death of Edward VI. In matters of religion Dudley was a complete cynic, but he needed the support of the "new men," with the result that the religious innovations of his regime were far more extreme than those of Somerset's. Stephen Gardiner was removed from his bishopric and confined to the Tower; other conservative bishops were deprived of their sees, to be replaced by such extreme radicals as Nicholas Ridley and John Hooper, "the father of Nonconformity." Under such men as these the altars were removed from churches and the more extreme forms of Protestantism received official sanction. Near the close of Dudley's regime, in January 1552, the second Act of Uniformity gave official sanction to the second Edwardine Prayer Book, which in every respect was far more Protestant than its predecessor.

When the news that Henry VIII was dead and that Somerset was to be Lord Protector reached the English exiles on the Continent, they must have realized that in the near future they would be able to return to England. But they did not return at once. One suspects that they were waiting for the repeal of the Six Articles, under the terms of which, in one way or another, they were all guilty of capital offenses. This would have been especially true of Coverdale and Joye, both of whom were married. The Act of the Six Articles was formally abolished by the Act of Repeal on December 2, 1547. Shortly thereafter the exiles returned.

We know that Coverdale was back in England by June of 1548. I would place Joye's return from Antwerp or its evirons in the early spring of that year. Unquestionably he brought with him his wife and small son, and it would appear that for a year or more he settled in London. How he earned money to support his family during this period we do not know. The best guess is that once again he secured employment as a corrector at the press for some printer who would have known of his earlier work in this capacity. Perhaps it was in the printing establishment of Richard Jugge, for within a year two books by Joye were printed on Jugge's presses, although in one of these no printer's name is given and the colophon of the other has the baffling statement that it was printed by Goerge Joye.

The earlier of these two books was a translation, with many interpolations, of a strange book by Andreas Osiander (born Heiligmann or Hoseman), a learned and cantankerous German reformer. This was a Latin work entitled *Conjecturae de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi*, published at Nuremberg in 1544. It was translated into German the following year by Osiander himself, with the title *Vermütung von den letzten Zeiten und dem Ende der welt aus der heiligen Schrifft Gezogen.*[6]

Osiander's conjectures are based largely upon the apocalyptic chapters of the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse itself, and Joye probably came upon it when he was working on his own conflation of the commentaries on Daniel.

Joye's book (*S.T.C.* 188877), an octavo of 64 leaves,[7] bears the following title:

> The coniec- | tures of the ende of the | worlde, translated | by George | Joye. | Mark .xij. | ¶Be ye awake, for ye knowe | not, when the Lorde of the | house shall come, lest he com- | meth sodenly, and fynde you | sleapers. | M.D. xlviij.

The colophon reads:

> Mcccccxlv. Translated by George Joye whereine many things be added out of the said George his coniectures and now at laste printed in the yere M.D. xlviij. ¶ Math. xxv. A wake and watche for ye know not the daye nor yet the hower when the sone of man shall come.

The *Short-Title Catalogue* hesitantly suggests that the book was published at Antwerp, but the best modern opinion is that it was printed at London by Richard Jugge.[8] On the last page, after a list of "fautes escaped," occurs the statment that "These shal ye find in cheap ayenst the great Cundit at the signe of the foxe unbownde." Joye's address to the reader is dated May 1548. The best guess from all this would seem to be that Joye had made the translation in 1545, shortly after the appearance of Osiander's book; had for some reason or other been unable to get it printed; and had brought the manuscript with him when he came back to London in the spring of 1548.

Osiander, in his introduction, had said that his conjectures concern- the end of the world had circulated in manuscript and he was printing them lest any man presume to add to them. He obviously reckoned without George Joye, who announces in his address to the reader as well as in the colophon that he has not only added to but improved upon Osiander. In part, Joye's additions take the form of attacks upon John Fisher, Sir Thomas More, Stephen Gardiner, and both the universities of England, with incidental arguments in support of his views on the present state of the souls departed and the marriage of priests.

The conjectures themselves need not detain us, since they traverse much of the ground already covered in the commentary on Daniel. They are four in number: the first is based on the talmudic theory that there will be three "ages" of two thousand years each; the second upon the words of Jesus in the Gospels concerning the coming of the Kingdom; the third upon elaborate calculations derived from the Mosaic "great year" of fifty years between years of jubilee; the fourth upon supposed prophecies in Daniel and the Apocalypse relating to the city of Rome and the Church of Rome. Osiander's conclusion, arrived at in several ways, was that the world would end in 1656. Joye, by a different method of calculation, arrived at a different result. He was quite sure the end would come at a time somewhere between thirty-seven and sixty-seven years after the date of writing. Assuming this date to be 1545, we get an anterior date of 1582, a *terminus ad quem* of 1612.

The second book put out by Joye after his return to London was apparently the outgrowth of a quarrel with John Foxe the martyrologist. Foxe was at this time in his early thirties—a comparatively young man. In 1545 he had resigned his fellowship at Magdalen College, Oxford, because he was unwilling to take orders. Subsequently he had served as tutor to the Lucys of Charlcote, near Stratford-on-Avon. Now, having married a wife and being in need of employment, he had come up to London, where he began his literary career with English translations of three small Latin works by some of the German reformers. In 1548 he brought out his first original work, a small Latin tract of twenty-four leaves called *De non plectendis adulteris consultatio*. In 1549 the book was reissued with a different title—*De lapsis in ecclesiam recipiendis*—but with no change of content.[9] In his book Foxe argues against the death penalty for adultery, on the ground that it was neither useful nor necessary and that it violated the principle of charity taught by Christ in the Gospels. Christ hated the sin but not the sinner, said Foxe, and men should follow His example.

George Joye, never the man to give any quarter to either sin, sinners, or those who disagreed with him, was moved to reply. Since his return to London he had met Foxe personally. The two men had engaged in a number of disputations on the subject of adultery and adulterers, and Joye was of the opinion that Foxe had written his book as a direct attack upon Joye's views—"he twitcheth me therin, albe it not by name." Accordingly Joye fought back vigorously in a tract (*S.T.C.* 14822) with a characteristic title:

> A contrarye | (to a certayne manis) Con- | sultacion: That Adulterers ought to be | punyshed wyth deathe. Wyth the so- | lucions of his argumentes for the | contrarye. Made by George | Joye. | Whoso committeth adultery wyth | another mans wyfe, let them both dye | the death. Leui .xx. & Deu. xxij. ffor thus | shalt thou quenche thys wickednes out | of the comon wealth of thys realme.[10]

The colophon reads "Printed at London by George Joye," but the bibliographical evidence indicates that this tract, like the *Conjectures*, came from the press of Richard Jugge, in whose shop, as has been suggested, Joye may have been employed.[11] The book is undated, but it appeared after the second issue of Foxe's tract, probably also in 1549.

At no point in his tract does Joye mention Foxe by name, but there can be no question that Foxe is the "certain man" referred to in the title.[12] In addition to the use of the word "Consultacion" (compare Foxe's *consultatio*), we have the evidence of Joye's point-by-point reply to Foxe's argument, and the statements in the text that the author of the book which Joye was attacking was a young man and that his book had been reissued with a changed title but an unchanged text.

Foxe had argued, says Joye, that in the Christian dispensation the old law should not apply, and had supported his position with the account of Christ's forgiveness of the woman taken in adultery. But the young man here reveals his ignorance, for on that occasion Christ was simply refusing to act as a magistrate and insisting upon His Godhood, since only God can forgive sins. Adultery, Joye continues, was a capital offense not only in Israel but also in Egypt and in Rome. It is a capital offense in Germany and in the Holy Roman Empire. Latimer was on my side of the argument, says Joye, when he openly preached against adultery before Henry VIII. So is Bullinger, the great Swiss reformer.

Yet this young man, Joye concludes, presumes to urge the opposite view upon preachers and magistrates, saying that if they execute adulterers they are setting themselves in the place of God. What would happen to the commonwealth if this attitude were applied to all crimes? And so on for over a hundred pages, more than twice as many as Foxe needed for his more amiable treatment of the subject. So far as is known, Foxe made no reply to Joye and there is no other record of further personal association between the two men. One wonders whether this controversy resulted in an estrangement which might account for the fact that in his *Acts and Monuments* Foxe makes so little mention of Joye and his writings.

So far as is known, Joye's reply to Foxe was the last work to come from his pen. For twenty years he had used that pen indefatigably in support of the causes to which he was committed—the importance of having the Scriptures in English, and the necessity for defending those theological opinions which he believed true and for confuting those which he believed erroneous. All but a half dozen of those years had been spent on the Continent. The years of exile must have been years of penury, or at best of bare subsistence, for he had no regular income and whatever wages he may have earned as corrector at the press for various printing establishments would have been slender and sporadic. It is therefore pleasant to record that he was enabled to spend the last few years of his life in modest comfort.

The turn in his fortunes came in September 1549, when he was given the rectory of Blunham in his native Bedfordshire, the first living he had enjoyed since being deprived of his fellowship at Peterhouse in 1527. Blunham was in the diocese of Lincoln, and the Lincoln Registers record that the living was presented to Joye by the patron, Sir Henry Grey, of Flytton, Bedfordshire, upon the death of the previous incumbent, Roger Tonge. Tonge, a Cambridge D.D. and one of the chaplains of Edward VI, was buried at St Margaret's, Westminster, on September 2, 1549. There was obviously little delay in giving the living to Joye, for he was presented to the Bishop on September 28 by Sir Henry Grey, who signed the deed, and was instituted at London on November 16.[13] The instituting bishop would have been Henry Holbeach, a man sympathetic to the Reformation, who had been Hugh Latimer's suffragan when the latter was Bishop of Worcester. The Composition Books give the value of the living as £46. 2. 10, and record that Sir Henry Grey, Thomas Acworth, merchant tailor of London, and Joye himself were the guarantors that the first fruits—that is, the first year's income—would be paid to the crown in the usual instalments.[14]

As country livings went, Blunham was a comparatively good one. It is difficult to translate the money of the sixteenth century into the values of today, but if we conservatively multiply by fifty we get a value of something like £2300, or $7000. Obviously Joye was now better off than he had ever been before. I have been unable to discover anything significant about Sir Henry Grey of Flytton, to whose patronage Joye was indebted. No doubt he was a man of Protestant leanings, eager to give the benefice to a rector sympathetic to his views.

In 1552, Joye was given the living of Ashwell in Hertfordshire, upon the resignation of Barnard Sandeford or Sandeforth. This benefice, valued at £22. 3. 6, was in the gift of the Bishop of London,[15] at this time no less a person than Nicholas Ridley, whose stern and unflagging Protestantism was to lead to his martyrdom in 1555. Ridley was a Cambridge man, of the same academic generation and theological coloration as Joye. There can be little doubt that Joye owed his appointment to Ashwell to the friendship and good will of Ridley. He was presented to the living on March 21, 1552, and one month later arranged for the payment of his first fruits, with Barnard Sandeford, the resigned vicar, and William Burham, rector of Therfelde, Herts, standing as guarantors.[16]

There is no record in the Lincoln Registers of Joye's having resigned the living at Blunham when he became vicar of Ashwell, and we are confronted with the possibility that he held both livings and thus became a pluralist. I am inclined to think that such is the case. It is unlikely that he would have willingly given up Blunham for a living with less than half the income, and there is nothing to suggest that he was required to do so. Nor need we feel that his strict views would have prevented him from becoming a pluralist. It was not until the nineteenth century that plurality of benefices ceased to be respectable.

There is one point, however, which suggests another possibility. The Lincoln Registers, which are incomplete and confused for this period, record that on June 2, 1554 (this was almost a year after the accession of Mary Tudor) Gabriel Power was instituted as rector of Blunham, Bedfordshire, on deprivation of Barnard Standiforth, last rector there.[17] Standiforth is no doubt to be identified with the Sandeford whom Joye succeeded as vicar of Ashwell. There is a possibility, I suppose, that Joye and Sandeford exchanged livings in 1552. But this seems to me most unlikely. Sandeford, sometime fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, was a Doctor of Civil Law. He was rector of St Martin, Ludgate, from 1542 to 1550, a prebend of Westminster from 1546 to 1554, and vicar of Canewdon, Essex, from 1547 until he was deprived in 1554.[18] It seems to me much more likely that he was given the living at Blunham after Joye's death, which probably occurred late in 1553, only to be deprived a few months later in the upheavals which followed the reign of Mary.

Even if Joye held both livings, as I think likely, there is every reason to believe that he would have been a faithful shepherd—a "flock-feeder," to use one of his favorite words—of both parishes.[19] Ashwell, in the extreme north central part of Hertfordshire, was an easy day's journey from Blunham. (Both parishes are now in the diocese of St Albans.) With a curate in one parish and himself doing the work of the other, he could have kept a watchful eye on both. Although there is no record of his incumbency of either parish, it is impossible not to believe, from the whole record of his life and writings, that he would have entered enthusiastically into a cure of souls, preaching, exhorting, admonishing. Whatever else he may have been, he was a conscientious man who would have done his work faithfully, according to his lights.

In both of these parishes Joye would have found handsome churches. Both survive, and are of sufficient historical and architectural importance to be given considerable space, with ground plans and photographs, in the Victoria Histories of the counties of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire.[20] St Edmund's, Blunham, is large for a country parish church, with an over-all length of about 90 feet. It has two side chapels. The tower is Norman, dating from about 1100; the rest of the work is of various later periods. The Church of St Mary at Ashwell is even larger, its over-all length being about 140 feet. It has a striking west tower surmounted by a spire; the total height is 176 feet. The oldest parts of the church date from the fourteenth century.

Joye's incumbency at both churches came after the fall of Somerset and the rise of Northumberland—that is, in the period when the most extreme forces of Protestantism had been unleashed to go about the work of stripping the churches of all the outward symbols of the old religion. Much as one may deplore the way in which so much of the ecclesiastical art of the Middle Ages was destroyed by the reformers during the reign of Edward VI, one can only suppose that George Joye, first at Blunham, then at Ashwell, went about the business with enthusiasm. It would have been most congenial to him to supervise the destruction of the altars, the removal of the statues and all else that smacked of popery. In both churches there are vestiges of the work which was destroyed. At Blunham, for example, during alterations in the middle of the nineteenth century, there were discovered some fragments of a fifteenth-century reredos of English alabaster. The surviving fragments represent Our Lord's Pity, the Road to Calvary, and Our Lady and Child.

During the last four years of his life, then, Joye came into what was for him a safe harbor. He was freed from the economic insecurity, bordering at times on privation, which he had known for twenty years. He would have been able to provide well for the wife who had shared the hardships of those years and for the son George, born about 1543, who would now be of an age to be entered in one of the local grammar schools.[21] As far as can be known, Joye engaged in no printed controversy after the dispute with John Foxe in 1548-49. Probably he was busy with parochial duties. Probably also he felt that the cause for which he had fought was won, although, like all the reformers, he must have felt some uneasiness over the continuing frailty of the boy king and the possibility that Mary Tudor would succeed to the throne.

These fears were realized when Edward died on July 6, 1553. Within a few days the bold attempt to establish poor Lady Jane Grey as Queen had collapsed, and Mary was proclaimed. Northumberland, the engineer of the plot, was executed as a traitor on August 21. In the ecclesiastical hierarchy the conservatives were quickly restored to the positions of power—Gardiner to the see of Winchester, Tunstall to Durham, Bonner to London in place of Ridley. The old forms of worship were restored with equal speed. The use of the English Prayer Book was forbidden and the Mass officially restored by Act of Convocation. To the more extreme reformers it was obvious that they faced the alternatives of recantation, flight, or imprisonment and very likely death. Many chose to continue the battle from Basel or Frankfort or Geneva. Many others—Rogers, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer—stood their ground, to have their names immortalized in Foxe's Book of Martyrs.

George Joye was certainly among those who would have been compelled to make this hard choice, for as recently as 1546 he had been listed among those arch-heretics whose books were condemned to be burned. It is impossible to believe that he would have recanted. His previous history suggests that he would have been among those who fled overseas. But death spared him the agony of making the hard choice. The date is uncertain; all we know is that he was dead by April 21, 1554, when a Richard Rudde was instituted to the living at Ashwell, vacant by reason of his decease.[22] I think he must have died some months before, perhaps as early as September 1553, else he would certainly have been among the first to be called to account for heresy if he had not already fled the country. There is no record that he had been called to account, and he certainly had not fled, for both Bale and Fuller assert that he was buried in "his own country." Whether they meant in England or more specifically in his native Bedfordshire is not clear.

Honest Thomas Fuller, whose sympathies for the reformers were boundless, and who included Joye among his worthies of England, may well be allowed to write the closing words of this account of the life and work of George Joye.[23] Says Fuller: "The particulars of his suffering, if known, would justly advance him into the reputation of a confessor. ... Notwithstanding many machinations against his life, he found his coffin where he fetched his cradle, *in sua patria sepultus*, being peaceably buried in his native country 1553, the last year of King Edward the Sixth."

NOTES TO CHAPTER 15

[1] Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (ed. Pratt), V, 561–564.

[2] Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors*, I, 168–169.

[3] Steele, *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations*, No. 295. The full text is printed in Wilkins, *Concilia*, IV, 1.

[4] The certificate is printed in Foxe (ed. Pratt) V, Appended Document No. XVIII.

[5] The list was printed by Foxe in his first ed. (1563). He omitted it from his later editions, but it will be found in Pratt's, V, 566–68. For discrepancies between the list in the Bonner register and Foxe's transcription, see Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles*, Appendix H. The list of Joye's books given below is transcribed from

Foxe, 1563, except that Foxe, probably by accident, omitted Item 4, which is here restored from the Bonner register.

[6] Copies of both Latin and German versions are in the Rare Book Collection of the University of Pennsylvania.

[7] Collation: 8°. A-C8; D, 11 leaves; E, 9 leaves; F-G8, H1-3. 64 leaves. The volume presents a number of interesting bibliographical problems.

[8] Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles*, p. 341.

[9] See Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book*, pp. 31-33, 243. The second issue is not recorded in *S.T.C.* There is a copy in the Lambeth Library.

[10] Collation: 8°. A-G6^r.

[11] See note 8, above.

[12] See also the note by Mozley, *Times Literary Supplement*, 14 Nov. 1942, p. 559.

[13] Lincoln Register 27, fol. 275.

[14] P.R.O., *Book of Compositions*. The first fruits were customarily paid in four or five instalments, at intervals of about six months.

[15] The advowson was originally in the possession of the abbots of Westminster. After the dissolution it passed to the Bishop of Westminster. When that diocese was abolished in 1550, having had only one bishop (Thirlby), the advowson of Ashwell passed to the Bishop of London.

[16] P.R.O., *Book of Compositions*; and Cussans, *History of Hertfordshire*, I, Pt. 3, p. 41.

[17] Lincoln Register 28, fol. 101, 125, 170.

[18] See Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part One*, IV, 18.

[19] At the time of the dissolution the parish of Blunham numbered 340 "houselyng people." I have not found any statement of the number at Ashwell.

[20] *Victoria Histories of the Counties of England*: *Bedfordshire*, III, 228, 231-233; *Hertfordshire*, III, 204-208. For the church at Ashwell see also Cussans, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-43.

[21] George Joye the younger had a career of modest success in the Church. He was A.B. from St. John's, Cambridge, 1563-64; Fellow, 1565; M.A., 1567; B.D., 1575. He was ordained deacon in 1569. He was rector of St Peter's, Sandwich, Kent, 1570-77; vicar of Higham, 1573-75; vicar of St Clement's, Sandwich, 1574-1600. He died in 1600. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part One*, II, 491.

[22] P.R.O., *Book of Compositions*.

[23] *The History of the Worthies of England* (ed. P. Austin Nuttall), I, 170.

Appendix A

The account of George Joye in John Bale's *Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum summarium* (1548) folio 239^{v}-240

Georgius Ioye, Bedfordiensis, de domo Petri Cantabrigiae, post liberalium arti*um* professione*m* theologicae facultatis bacchalaureus, utraque lingua Latina & Graeca peritus, in Aristotelicis delirijs non consenuit. Sed dum adhuc flor*en*ti esset aetate, exorta ueritatis luce, manum admouit caelestis doctrinae aratro. Spiritualem enim & omni ex parte synceram Christi philosophiam, ex purissimis Euangeliorum fontibus hauri*en*s, arida multorum corda ea humectabat. Vnde & incommoda nonnulla sub Eboracensi tunc Cardinale, Moro, Roffense, atque alijs adhuc Antichristi propugnatoribus pertulit, compulsus tu*m*demum in Germaniam cum alijs plaerisque aufugere. Vbi accepta in Dei uerbo uxore christiana, in toto esse desijt corruptissimi monstri creatura. Varios iste Bibliorum libros, ac alios christianorum autorum labores, Anglicos nobis dedit,

Psalterium ex foelice, li.l.
Prouerbia Salomonis, li.l.
Ecclesiasten eiusdem, li.l.
Esaie uaticinium, li.l.
Hieremiae prophetiam, li.l.
Hortulum animae, li.l.
Melanthonem de coniugio, li.l.
Zwinglium de religione, li.l.
Ex Erasmo quoque, li.l.

Composuit in Anglico sermone.

Labefactatam ecclesiam Mori, li.l. Postquam placuisset pijssimo,
Ad priorem de Newenham, li.l. Patri nostro reuenderissimo,
Compendium passionis Christi, li.l. Seruator noster Christus in ult,
Apologiam ad Tyndale, li.l.

De coeni domini, li.l. Cum iudisset epulones Christus,
De baptismo & eucharistia, li.l. Quia constat homo ex duabus,
Matrimonij defensionem, li.l. Cum populus Dei, Israel voce,
Onera caeremoniarum, li.l. Paulus electum uas Dei,
Commentarios in Danielem, li.l. Haec cum in bruma scriberem,
Contra Gardineri articulos, li.l. Quosdam casu articulos inue,
Refutationem eorundem, li.l Intelleges candide lector, quod,

Et alia quaedam Praefatam in Daniele*m* expositionem collegit ex Philippo Melanthone, Oecolampadio, Pellicano, Draconite, atque alijs scriptoribus probis. Huiusque perstat fidelis ac robustus ueritatis assertor, cum hostibus Christi fortiter dimicans, anno eiusdem seruaboris nostri (quo haec scripsimus) 1548. sub rege Edwardo sexto.

Appendix B

Additional Selections from Joye's Translations of the Old Testament

I. Psalm 95 : 1-7 (from the Psalter of 1530)

Come and let vs triumphe let vs make melody to the lorde: the defender of owre helthe.

Let vs haste to come into his presens with prayse gyvynges: let vs synge vnto hym with hymnes.

For the lorde is a righte grete god and kynge/ over all goddis.

In whois hande are the depe secretes of the erthe: and the heighthes of the hylles.

The see is hys/ for he made it: & all conteined theryn his handes have fashoned.

Come therfore and let vs worshyppe: and fall downe vppon ower knees before the lorde owre maker.

For he is oure god and we are the people of his pasture/ and the flocke whom he dryvethe.

II. Psalm 95 : 1-7 (from Ortulus Anime, 1530)

Come and let vs ioyfully geue thankes vnto the lorde: let us reioyse in god ower saviour/ let vs approche into his presens with praise & thankes gevinge/ and singe we vnto hym in the Psalmes.

For god is a grete lorde and a grete kynge over al goddis in whose handes are the hartes of all the creatures of the erthe and the hyghe hilles are at his commaundement.

The see is his/ for he hath made it and his handes haue fasshoned the erthe also: come therfore and let vs worshipe and faldowne before the lorde which hath made vs: for he is ower god and we are the flocke of his pasture and the shepe whom he driuethe.

III. Psalm 95 : 1-7 (from the Psalter of 1534)

Come and let vs leap for ioye before the lorde/ let vs synge vnto the rocke of our sauinge helth.

Let vs come before him with tha*n*kis geuinge/ & in the Psalms singe vnto him.

For he is the lorde/ both god & kinge/ most mighty aboue al goddis. In his handis ar the depe secretis of the erthe/ and also the strength of the mountains.

The sea is his/ for he hathe made it/ al the drye lande ioyninge therto/ his handis haue facioned it.

Come and let vs faldowne before him/ let vs bowe downe oure knees and beseche the Lorde oure maker.

For he is our god/ and we be the peple of his pasture/ & the flok of his hande.

IV. Jonah 2 "The Prayer of the prophete Ionas" (from *Ortulus Anime*, 1530)

Ionas prayed vnto the lorde his god in th*e* whales belye/ sayinge: in my affliccion I kryed vnto the lorde/ and he answerde me. Even from the belye of hell I kryed/ and thou hardest my voyce. for thou haddest throne me forthe into the middes of the depeste of the see. And th*e* waters closed me aboute/ all thy grete waues and flowdes wente over me. And I thought sayinge withe my selve. I am caste oute of thy sighte/ I shal nevermore se thy holy temple. for waters have compassed me yn/ even vp vnto my soule. The derke depeth closed me yn and the fowle stinkinge wedes of the see covred my hed. I sanke downe vnder the foundacions of the hilles/ so that the waters barred me oute from therthe for ever. But thou madest my lyfe to aryse frome dethe (O lorde my god). When my soule fayeled me/ yet I remembred the lorde/ and my prayer came vnto thy holy temple. They that ar geven to vanyte and lyes/ haue loste their mercy frome god. But I shal offer vnto the/ lowde prayse/ & shall performe my vowes to the Lorde/ whiche is a Savioure. for the lorde commaunded the fysshe/ and a non she cast out Ionas vpo*n* th*e* drye la*n*de.

V. Isaiah 35 (from *The Prophete Isaye*, 1531)

The desertes and wyldernes shalbe glad/ th*e* drye lande also shal reioyse and flouresshe lyke a lyle: It shal flouresshe righte plesantly it shal laughe and reioyse more and more/ and be beutyfull to beholde. For the beutye of Libanus shalbe geven hyr/ the comelynes of Charmelus and Sarone also shall she haue/ the Gentyles shall knowledge the glorye of the lorde and th*e* magestye of ower God. Be therfore counforted ye syke handes/ and be steffe/ ye faynte knees/

speake vnto the faynte harted saynge/ be bolde and stronge/ and feare not. Beholde/ yower God shall come to avenge yowe and to rewarde yowe/ ye he shal come to saue yowe. And then shal the eyes of the blynde be illumined/ and the eares of the deffe shalbe opened. Then shal the lame leape lyke an harte/ and the domme tonge shall speake prayse. Fountayns and springes shal breke forth in the deserte/ and swete ryuers in the drye lande/ so that the drye lande shal have hyr pondes a*n*d the thirstye erthe hyr quycke springes. In the same dennes where the dragons laye/ shal growe swete flowers and grene rushes. There shall lye bypathes and the kinges highe waye whiche shalbe called even the holy waye. A polluted man shall not passe thorowe it/ for the Lorde hym selfe shall go withe them thorowe the same waye that fooles go not oute of it/ here shalbe no lyo*n*/ nor eny other nyouse beste shall come vp to this waye or be fownde yn it/ but ryght suer shall the passage be/ also they that shalbe redemed of the Lorde shalbe turned and come vnto Zion with prayse & shal haue euerlastinge Joye/ gladnes & solace shal acompany them but hevynes and sorowe shalbe fled awaye.

VI. Jeremiah 10 : 1-13 (from *Ieremy the Prophete*, 1534)

Here the sermone of the Lorde whiche he sendeth vnto you oh house of Israel/ sayng thus. Be not lerned aftir the wayes of the gentyles/ nether fear ye at the sygnes of the skye or heuen whiche the gentyles feare. For the rytes and lawes of the gentyles ar very vanite. They wil go cut downe a tre frome the wode and fasshion it withe the handis & axe of the artificer/ than is it made gaye with golde or syluer/ and fastened with hamers and naylis that it moue not nor go not a waye. It standeth as stiffe as the palme tre/ it speketh not/ it gothe not/ but is borne onely. Be not afrayd of siche thingis: for they may do nether good nor harme. But vnto the (oh Lorde) none is lyke/ thou ar grete/ and grete is the name of thy power. Who ought not to feare the? Or what kinge among al nacions ought not to obaye the? For amonge al the wyse of the gentyles/ and in al their kingdomes/ none is lyke the. They ar al a lyke/ vnlerned and vnwyse. All their crafte and coning is but vanite. Syluer is brought hither from Tharsis/ and beten forth into thinne plates. And golde is brought from Ophir and beaten into the worke of the crafte man by the hande of the caster and cled with byse [i.e., *azure*] and purple. Siche is the worke of al their wittye men togither. But the Lorde is the very God/ the lyuing God and kinge euerlasting. He being angrye the erthe tre*m*bleth: his indignacion no peple may beare. But as touchinge these Idols thus shal ye reporte by them. They ar goddes whiche made nether heuen nor erthe. They shal perisshe therfore as wel from therthe as from these thingis which ar vnder this skye. But as concerning this our God/ ye shal saye. He hath made the erthe by hys power/ & finesshed the rownde worlde by his wysedome/ and stretched forth the heuens by his vnderstanding/ at his voyce miche water runneth togither in the ayer/ clowdes ar lyfted vp from the extreme partes of therthe. He turneth thonder into rayne/ and ledeth forthe the wyndes out of their secrete places.

VII. Proverbs 10 : 27—11 : 7 (from *The Proverbes of Solomon* [1534?])

The feare of the lorde gyueth longe lyfe: whan the daies of the vngodly ar shortened. Gladnes abydeth the rightwise: wher the hope of the vngodly p*er*isheth. The way of the lorde accourageth the good: but it deiecteth th*e* myndes of the vngodly. The ryghtwyse shall neuer be ouerthrowen: whan the vngodly shall nat abyde vpon the erth. The mouth of the iust wyl nat deceyue: but the deceytfull tonge shall perisshe. The lyppes of the ryghtwyse ar occupied about goodnes: but the mouth of the vngodly is busyed about euyll.

A false weight the lorde abhoreth: but in iust balau*n*ces he delyghteth. Pride is matched with dispyte: but wysedom is with the gentle. The right opinio*n* of th*e* p*er*fit shal promone the*m*: but the bli*n*dnes of the vngodly shalbe their owne destruction. Riches helpe nat in the day of wrath: but mercye delyuereth from dethe. The rightwysenes of the perfyte/ dyrecteth him his way: but the vngodly falleth at his owne wyckednesse. Ryghtwysnesse delyuereth the foythfull: whan the synfull are trapped in their owne mischef. In the deth of the vngodly/ his hope faileth him: & the expectation of the wyked shal perisshe.

VIII. Ecclesiastes 9 : 10-18 (from *Ecclesiastes* [1534?])

What so ever good dede is offred unto thy hande/ do it consta*n*tly/ spedely/ & boldely: For in thy grave/ unto whiche thou art bent to descend*e*/ there is nothinge to do: there is neither erudition/ coninge/ knowlege/ nor wysedom. Over this/ yet I turned me to se how all thinges were done under the sonne. And I espied th*a*t a man to hasty & swyfte/ was nothynge apte to ro*n*ne nor strength helped nat in batail: nor circu*m*specte p*ro*vision for food & winning: neither yet sharpe wylines to helpe to have riches: neither coude co*n*ninge bringe a man into favour: but that al this depe*n*deth of time & fortune. A ma*n* knoweth nomore his time of deth than the fisshe of her takynge wi*th* the hoke or birde of her snare/ so sodenly cometh deth upon ma*n* & taketh hi*m* at his time. Also I co*n*sydered wysely yet another thinge under the sonne/ & me thought it no small wysedom. I saw a cite/ nat very gret nor yet full of people/ & yet was there a kinge of no smal puisau*n*ce besegi*ng* it & castyng up bulwerkes & bankes against it. In which cite there was a certain simple pore wyse man/ by whose wisdom the lytle cite might have be*n* defended & delyvered fro*m* their enimies: but no ma*n* regarded him: & here a no*n* iuged I/ wisdom to be better than strength. Natwithsta*n*ding yet was this pore mannes wysdom neglected/ no ma*n* in the cite heryng hi*m*. Wherfore/ ye wordes of ye wise ar of more weight/ although they be softely spoken than the lowde noyse of an unwise prince. Wherfore wysedom is better tha*n* all their armour & harnes. And one ydle unthrifty man troubleth many good me*n*.

IX. Daniel 6 : 16-24 (from *The exposicion of Daniel the Prophete*, 1545)

Then at the kings co*m*mandment Daniel was brought forth/ and thei did caste him into the lyons den. Then the kinge spekinge to daniel sayd: Thy god whom thou hast euer worshipped delyuer the. And ther was broughte a stonne and layde vpon the mouth of the denne which stonne the kinge with his owne seall or ring and with the signet of his nobles sealed/ that there shulde nothinge els be done ayenst daniel/ or lest his will shuld be changed in daniel.

Then the kinge going into his palace went to bed souperlesse/ no meat brought him/ he slept not that night/ as sone as it was daye lyght the kinge arose & went spedely to the denne of the lyons/ and beinge therat/ he with a moorninge voyce called daniel sayinge: Oh daniel the seruant of the lyuing god/ hath not th*e* power of thy god whom always thou hast worshipped, delyuered the from the lyo*ns*? Anon daniell answerd the kinge sainge/ oh king euer mought thou lyue: My god hath sent me his aungell which hath closed vp the lyons mouthes that thei shuld not hurt me. For before him am I founde innocent/ nether ayenst the/ oh kinge haue I co*m*mitted any fawlte. Then was the king excedengly ioifull and commanded daniel to be plukt out of the denne/ in whom now plukt out, there was no hurte founde done to him of the lyons because he beleued in his god.

Then at the kings commandeme*nt* were his accusers & enimies brought forth/ which w*ith* their chyldren and wyues were throne into th*e* lyons whom ere they coulde come to the floer of the denne/ the lyons toke them/ & broke all their bones.

Appendix C

Additional Examples of Joye's Revisions of Tyndale's New Testament

In addition to the intentional revisions cited in Chapter 8 (pp. 156-162) the following selective list of fifty more such revisions may be of interest. *In this list Joye's revisions have been put in square brackets.* Where the readings of the Authorized Version (AV), 1611 and the Revised Standard Version (RS), 1946 lend some support to Joye, they are given in parentheses following the Tyndale-Joye renderings.

Matt. 6 : 25	Ys not the lyfe more *worth* [*worthy*] then meate?
Matt. 11 : 19	And wysdome ys *iustified* [*allowed*] off her chyldren.
Matt. 27 : 11	Jesus sayd vnto hym: Thou *sayest* [*sayest it*].
Mark 8 : 12	... and he syghed in his *sprete* [*mynde*] ...
Mark 14 : 33	... and he began to waxe *abasshed* [*a frayde*] ...
Luke 7 : 30	But the pharyses and scribes despised the *counsell* [*mynde*] off God agaynst them selves ...
Luke 7 : 49	Who is this whych forgeveth *synnes also* [*euen synnes*]? (AV: *sins also*. RS: *even sins*)
Luke 8 : 46	For I perceave that *vertue* [*power*] is gone oute of me ... (AV: *virtue*. RS: *power*)
Luke 9 : 51	... when the time was com that he shulde be *receaved* [*taken*] up ...
Luke 11 : 13	Howe moche more shall your father celestiall/ geve *a goode sprete* [*the holy goost*] to them/ that desire it of hym.
Luke 15 : 5	And when he had found hym/ he *putteth* [*leueth* = lifts up] hym on his shulders with ioye.
Luke 16 : 8	And the lorde *commended* [*praysed*] the uniust stewarde ...

Luke 16 : 13	… or els he shall *lene* [*cleue*] to the one/ and despyse the other. AV: *hold*)
Luke 17 : 20	The kyngdom of God commeth not with *waytinge* [*wtwarde* (*sic* for *outward*) *lokyng*] fore. (AV: *observation*)
Luke 19 : 9	This daye is healthe come vnto this housse: for as moche as *it also is become the childe* [*this same housse is become the doughter*] off Abraham.
John 3 : 16	God soo *loved* [*loueth*] the worlde …
John 5 : 27	And hath geven hym power alsoo to iudge *in that he is* [*al though he be*] the sonne of man.
John 7 : 52	Searche and loke/ for out of Galile aryseth *noo* [*not the*] prophet.
John 13 : 3	And that he *was* [*had*] come from God/ and *went* [*shuld go*] to God …
John 15 : 18	Yf the worlde hate you/ ye knowe that *he* [*yt*] hated me before *he* [*yt*] hated you. (AV: *it*)
John 18 : 38	Pilate sayde vnto hym: what is *trueth* [*the trueth*]?
John 21 : 21	When Peter sawe hym/ he sayde to Jesus: Lorde what shall *he here do* [*become of this man*]?
Acts 3 : 16	And the fayth which ys by him/ hath to thys man geven thys *health* [*perfayt health*]/ in the presence of you all. (AV: *perfect soundness*)
Acts 4 : 26	The kyngs of the erth stode vp and the ruelars cam to gedder agaynst the lorde/ And agaynst his *Christ* [*anoynted*].
Acts 4 : 32	The multitude of them that beleved/ were off won hert/ And off won *soule* [*mynde*].
Acts 5 : 34	… Gamaliell/ a *doctour off* [*techer of the*] lawe …
Acts 7 : 44	Oure fathers had the tabernacle of *testimony* [*the couenant*] in wildernes …
Acts 8 : 32	The *tener* [*mater*] off the scripture which he redde was this. (AV: *place*)
Acts 11 : 9	… count not those thyngs *comen* [*unclene*]/ which God hath clensed.

Acts 13 : 2	The holy gost sayd: *seperat* [*put a parte for*] me Barnabas and Saul ... (AV: *separate.* RS: *set apart*)
Acts 24 : 15	*and have hope tewards god/ that the same resurreccion from derth* [sic] (*which they them selves loke for also*) *shalbe both of iust and uniust* [*hauinge hope in god off the lyfe that the dead shal haue both iust and uniuste/ which lyf they their selues loke fore*].
Rom. 9 : 33	Beholde I *put* [*laye*] in syon a stomblynge stone ... (AV: *lay*)
Rom. 12 : 2	But be ye chaunged in youre shape/ by the renuynge of youre *wittes* [*minde*] ... (AV: *mind*)
Rom. 12 : 19	avenge nott youreselves butt geve *roume* [*place*] vnto the wrath of god.
Rom. 13 : 9	... yf there be eny other commaundement/ *are all comprehended* [*it is al comprehended*] in this sayinge ... (AV: *it is briefly comprehended*)
Rom. 14 : 4	... he shall *stonde* [*be sustayned that he myght stonde*]. (AV: *He shall be holden up*)
I Cor. 2 : 14	Nether can he preceave them because *he is spretually* [*they be spirituall*] examyned ... (AV: *they are spiritually discerned*)
I Cor. 14 : 40	Lett all thynges be done *honestly* [*comely*] and in order.
II Cor. 9 : 10	... and increace the frutes of youre *rightewesnes* [*almose*].
II Cor. 10 : 10	... but his bodyly presence is weake/ and his speache *whomly* [*rude*]. (AV: *contemptible*)
Eph. 1 : 6	... his glorious grace/ where with he hath made vs accepted in *the beloved* [*his beloued sonne*].
I Tim. 5 : 22	*Laye* [*Put not thy*] hondes sodenly on no man ...
II Tim. 4 : 7	... and have kept the *fayth* [*promyse*].
Titus 3 : 5	... but off his mercie/ he saved us/ by the fountayne of the newe birth/ *and* [*that is to wete*] with the renuynge off the holy goost ...
Heb. 11 : 21	Jacob ... *worshipped on the toppe* [*fyll downe before the mayeste*] of his ceptre. (AV: *worshipped, leaning on top of his staff.* RS: *bowing in worship over the head of his staff*)

I Peter 2 : 20	For what prayse is it/ if when ye *be buffetted* [*suffre*] for youre fautes/ ye take it paciently?
I John 1 : 1–2	… which we have loked apo*n*/ a*n*d oure hondes have handled/ *of the worde of* [*euen that same thing which is*] lyfe. For *the* [*that*] life apered/ and we have *sene* [*sene yt*] *and* [*wherfore we*] beare witnes/ and shewe vnto you that eternall lyfe …
I John 1 : 8	… we deceave oure selves/ and *trueth* [*the trueth*] is not in vs. (AV: *the truth*)
I John 1 : 10	Yf we saye we *have not sinned* [*are no sinners*]/ we make hym a lyar …
I John 3 : 16	Hereby perceave we *love* [*the loue of God*] … (AV: *the love of God*)

Bibliography

I. A Short-Title List of Joye's Works

The following list is chronologically arranged. The numbers in parentheses following each entry indicate the pages of the present work at which full titles and other details may be found.

(1) 1529-30: [?The Prymer in English]. Not extant.

(2) 1530, Jan. 16: *The Psalter of Dauid in Englishe*. Signed "Johan Aleph." Strassburg [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 2370.

(3) 1530, [July?]: *Ortulus Anime. The garden of the soule.* Anon. Strassburg [Antwerp]. Not listed in *S.T.C.*

(4) 1531, May 10: *The Prophete Isaye/ translated into englysshe.* Strassburg [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 2777.

(5) 1531, June 10: *The letters which Iohan Ashwel Priour of Newnham ... sente secretely to the Bishope of Lyncolne.* Strassburg [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 845.

(6) 1534, [Feb.?]. *The Subuersion of Moris false foundacion.* Emdon [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 14829.

(7) 1534, May: *Ieremy the Prophete/ translated into Englisshe.* [Antwerp.] *S.T.C.* 2778.

(8) 1534, August: *Dauids Psalter/ diligently and faithfully translated.* [Antwerp.] *S.T.C.* 2372.

(9) 1534, August: *The new Testament as it was written/ and caused to be written/ by them which herde yt.* Antwerp. [The first edition of Joye's revision of Tyndale's New Testament.] *S.T.C.* 2825.

(10) ?1534: [Reprint of Number 2, above]. London. *S.T.C.* 2371.

(11) 1535, Jan. 9: [Second edition of Number 9 above] *with the Pistles taken out of the olde Testament.* Antwerp. *S.T.C.* 2827.

(12) 1535, Feb. 27: *An Apologye ... to satisfye (if it may be) W. Tindale.* [London or Antwerp?]. *S.T.C.* 14820. Reprinted in *The English Scholar's Library*, ed. by Edward Arber, No. 13, Birmingham, 1883.

(13) ?1535: *The proverbes of Solomon newly translated into Englyshe. Here foloweth the boke of Solomon called Ecclesiastes.* Anon. London. *S.T.C.* 2752.

(14) 1535, September: *A compendyouse somme of the very Christen relygyon.* London. *S.T.C.* 14821.

(15) 1541, April 27: *A frutefull treatis of Baptyme and the Lordis Souper.* Anon., possibly by Joye. Grunning [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 24217.

(16) 1541, August: *A very godly defense ... defending the mariage of Preistes* [translated from Melanchthon]. Signed "lewes beuchame," pseud. Lipse [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 17798.

(17) 1541, August: *The defence of the Mariage of Preistes: agenst Steuen Gardiner.* Signed "Iames Sawtry," pseud. *S.T.C.* 21804.

(18) ?1541: [Reprint of Number 2 above, with collects added.] *S.T.C.* 2374.

(19) 1543, February: *Our sauiour Iesus Christ hath not ouercharged his chirche with many ceremonies.* Anon. Zurich [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 14556.

(20) 1543, March: *The Rekening and declaracion of the faith and beleif of Huldrik Zwingly.* Anon. Zurich [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 26138.

(21) 1543, June: *George Ioye confuteth Winchesters false articles.* Wesill in Cliefe land [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 14826.

(22) 1543, June: *The unite and Scisme of the olde Chirche.* [Antwerp.] *S.T.C.* 14830.

(23) 1544, September: *A present consolacion for the sufferers of persecucion for ryghtwysenes.* [London.] *S.T.C.* 14828.

(24) 1545, August: *The exposicion of Daniel the Prophete.* Geneva [Antwerp]. *S.T.C.* 14823.

(25) 1546: *The refutation of the byshop of Winchesters derke declaration.* [London.] *S.T.C.* 14827.

(26) 1548, May: *The coniectures of the ende of the worlde, translated* [from Osiander]. [Antwerp.] *S.T.C.* 18877.

(27) 1548: [Reprint of Number 20, above]. Anon. Zurich [London]. *S.T.C.* 26139.

(28) ?1548: [Reprint of Number 5, above]. [London.] *S.T.C.* 846.

(29) ?1549: *A contrarye (to a certayne manis) Consultacion: That Adulterers ought to be punyshed wyth deathe.* [London.] *S.T.C.* 14822.

(30) 1550, [Jan.?]: [Reprint of Number 24, above]. London. *S.T.C.* 14825.

(31) 1550, April 9: [Reprint of Number 24, above]. London. *S.T.C.* 14824.

II. A List of Works Cited in the Text and Notes

AMES, JOSEPH. *Typographical Antiquities*, London, 1749. Revised by W. HERBERT., 3 vols. London, 1785-90..

ANDERSON, CHRISTOPHER. *The Annals of the English Bible.* 2 vols. London, 1845; rev. 1862.

ARBER, EDWARD. *The First Printed English New Testament.* London, 1871.

BALE, JOHN. *Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Scriptorum Summariam.* 1548. (*S.T.C.* 1295)

[BARLOW, JEROME or ROYE, WILLIAM]. *Rede me and be nott wroth* [Anon. Strassburg, 1528]. (*S.T.C.* 21427). Also in *English Reprints*, ed. by Edward Arber, Birmingham, 1871.

BARNES, ROBERT. *A supplicacion unto henrye the eyght.* London, 1534. (*S.T.C.* 1470)

BATESON, MARY ed. [Cambridge University] *Grace Book Beta. Parts I and II.* (Luard Memorial Series, Volumes II and III.) Cambridge, 1903, 1905.

Biblia the bible that is the holy scrypture. [Cologne], 1535. The "Coverdale Bible." (*S.T.C.* 2063)

The byble which is all the holy scripture. [Antwerp and London], 1537. The "Matthew Bible." (*S.T.C.* 2066)

The byble in Englyshe, that is to saye the content of all the holy scrypture. [Paris and London], 1539. The first "Great Bible." (*S.T.C.* 2068)

BROWNE, G. F. "On the Site of the White Horse or 'Germany.' " *Communications [Proceedings] of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, III (1879), 407.

BRUNFELS, OTTO. *Precationes Biblicae.* Strassburg, 1528.

BUCER, MARTIN. *Historia Supplicii Domini Iesu.* 1528.

BUCER, MARTIN [pseud., "Aretius Felinus"]. *Sacrorum psalmorum libri quinque.* Strassburg, 1529.

BUGENHAGEN, JOHN. *A compendious letter which Ihon Pomerane sent to Englande.* [n.p.] 1536. (*S.T.C.* 4021)

BURNET, GILBERT. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England.* Ed. by NICHOLAS POCOCK. 7 vols. Oxford, 1865.

BUTTERWORTH, CHARLES C. *The English Primers* (1529 *to* 1545). Philadelphia, 1953.

– *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible*, 1340-1611. Philadelphia, 1941.

Butterworth, Charles C. "Erasmus and Bilney and Foxe." *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LVII (1953), 575-79.

– "The Godfray Edition of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes." [University of Pennsylvania] *Library Chronicle*, XV (1948-49), 25-27.

– "The *Mystik sweet Rosary* of 1533." [University of Pennsylvania] *Library Chronicle*, XXI (1955), 91-99.

Chester, Allan G. *Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English*. Philadelphia, 1954.

– "The 'New Learning': A Semantic Note." *Studies in the Renaissance*, II, (1955), 139-47.

– "Robert Barnes and the Burning of the Books." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XIV (1951), 211-21.

Cotton, Henry. *Editions of the Bible and Parts Thereof from the year MDV. to MDCCCL with an Appendix containing Specimens* [etc.] 2nd ed. Oxford, 1852.

Cussans, John E. *History of Hertfordshire*. 3 vols. (8 pts.). London, 1870-71.

Draconites, Johan. *Commentarium in Danielum ex hebraeo versum*. 1544.

Eadie, John. *The English Bible: An External and Critical History of the Various Translations of Scripture*. 2 vols. London, 1876.

Ellis, Sir Henry, ed. *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*. Series I, 3 vols. Series II, 4 vols. Series III, 4 vols. London, 1825-46.

Erasmus. *An exhortation to the diligent studye of scripture*. [Antwerp], 1529. (*S.T.C.* 10493)

Foxe, John. *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church*. London, 1563. (*S.T.C.* 11222)

– *The Acts and Monuments* [Edited by R. R. Mendham and Josiah Pratt]. 4th ed., revised and corrected by Josiah Pratt. 8 vols. London, [1875].

– *De non plectendis adulteris consultatio*. London, 1549. (*S.T.C.* 11235)

Frith, John. *A boke made by John Frith answering unto M. Mores lettur*. 1533. (*S.T.C.* 11381)

– *A disputacion of purgatorye* [Antwerp? 1535?]. (*S.T.C.* 11388)

Frith, John [*anon.*]. *A pistle to the christen reader: the reuelation of antichrist*. [Antwerp], 1529. (*S.T.C.* 11394)

Fry, Francis. *A Bibliographical Description of the New Testament: Tyndale's Version in English with Numerous Readings, Comparisons of Texts, and Historical Notices*. London, 1878.

Fuller, Thomas. *The History of the Worthies of England*, edited by P. Austin Nuttall. 3 vols. London, 1840.

Furnivall, F. J., ed. *Political, Religious, and Love Poems.* (Early English Text Society, O.S. vol. 15). London, 1866.

Gardiner, Germayne. *A letter of a yonge gentylman.* London, 1534. (*S.T.C.* 11594)

Ginsburg, C. D. *Coheleth Commonly Called the Book of Ecclesiastes. Translated from the Original Hebrew with a Commentary, Historical and Critical.* London, 1861.

Halle, Edward. *The union of the two noble and illustre famelies York and Lancaster.* London, 1548. (*S.T.C.* 12722)

Henry VIII. *A copy of the letters, wherin kyng Henry the eyght made answere unto a certayn letter of Martyn Luther.* London, 1526. (*S.T.C.* 13086)

Hopf, Constantin. *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation.* Oxford, 1946.

– "The Story of the Passion and Resurrection in the English Primer." *Journal of Theological Studies*, new ser. II (1951), 68-82.

Isaac, Francis S. *English Printers' Types of the Sixteenth Century*. London, 1936.

Kronenberg, M. E. "Notes on English Printing in the Low Countries (Early Sixteenth Century)." *The Library*, 4th ser., IX (1928), 139.

Lea, Henry C. *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.* 2nd ed. Boston, 1884.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Arranged and catalogued by J. S. Brewer and James Gairdner. 21 vols. and addenda. London, 1862-1910.

Lewis, John. *A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament, into English, Both in MS. and in Print,* [etc.] 2nd ed. London, 1739.

Loane, M. L. *Masters of the English Reformation.* London, 1954.

Maitland, S. R. *Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England.* London, 1849.

Melanchthon, Philip. *In Danielem prophetam commentarius.* 1529. Reprinted in vol. 13 of *Philippi Melanthonis Opera*, 28 vols. (*Corpus Reformatorum.*) Halle, 1834-60.

– *Defensio Coniugii Sacerdotum.* Basel, 1540. Reprinted in vol. 23 of *Philippi Melanthonis Opera.* [See the preceding item in this list.]

MELANCHTHON, PHILIP. *Sententiae Salomonis iuxta hebraicem veritatem summa cura redditae.* Nuremberg, 1525.

MORE, SIR THOMAS. *The apologye of syr. Thomas More, knyght.* London, 1533. (*S.T.C.* 18078)

– *The confutacyon of Tyndales answere.* London, 1532. (*S.T.C.* 18079)

– *A dyaloge of syr Thomas More. Wherein be treatyd dyuers maters, as of the veneration & worshyp of ymagys.* [London], 1529. (*S.T.C.* 18084-85)

– *The second parte of the confutacion of Tyndals answere.* London, 1533. (*S.T.C.* 18080)

MOZLEY, J. F. *Coverdale and His Bibles.* London, 1953.

– *John Foxe and His Book.* London, 1940.

– *William Tyndale.* London, 1937.

– "George Joye, or Gee." *Notes & Queries,* CLXXXV (1943), 252-53.

– "Tyndale's 'Supper of the Lord'." *Notes & Queries,* CLXXXIII (1942), 305-06.

MULLER, JAMES A. *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction.* New York, 1926.

MULLER, JAMES A., ed. *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner.* New York, 1933.

[*The New Testament,* translated by WILLIAM TYNDALE, Worms, 1526.] (*S.T.C.* 2824)

The newe Testament, dylygently corrected by Willyam Tindale. Antwerp, 1534. (*S.T.C.* 2826)

The newe Testament yet once agayne corrected by W. Tindale. [Antwerp], 1535. The "G-H" edition. (*S.T.C.* 2830)

NIJHOFF, WOUTER, en M. E. KRONENBERG. *Nederlandsche Bibliographie van* 1500 *tot* 1540. 3 vols. The Hague, 1923-42.

OECOLAMPADIUS, JOHAN. *In Danielem prophetam Ioannis Oecolampadij libri duo.* Basel, 1530.

OSIANDER, ANDREAS. *Conjecturae de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi.* Nuremberg, 1544.

PANZER, GEORG W. F. *Annales typographici,* [etc.] 5 vols. Nuremberg, 1793-97.

PELICANUS, CONRAD. *Commentaria Bibliorum. Tomus Tertius* [Commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve]. Zurich, 1540.

POCOCK, NICHOLAS, ed. *Records of the Reformation: The Divorce, 1527-1533. Mostly now for the first time printed from MSS.,* [etc.] 2 vols. Oxford, 1870.

POLLARD, A. F. *Henry VIII.* London, 1905.

POLLARD, ALFRED W., ed. *Records of the English Bible. The Documents relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English,* 1525-1611. London, 1911.

POLLARD, A. W. and G. R. REDGRAVE, comps. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad,* 1475-1640. London, 1926.

RASTELL, JOHN. *A new boke of Purgatory.* London, 1530. (*S.T.C.* 20719)

SAYLE, C. E. *Early Printed Books in the University Library, Cambridge.* 4 vols. Cambridge, 1900-07.

SEARLE, WILLIAM G., ed. [Cambridge University] *Grace Book Gamma.* Cambridge, 1908.

SMITH, H. MAYNARD. *Henry VIII and the Reformation.* London, 1948.

SMITH, LACEY B. *Tudor Prelates and Politics.* Princeton, 1953.

STAEHELIN, ERNST. "Oekolampad-Bibliographie." *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde,* XVII (1918), 1-119.

State Papers, Henry VIII. 11 vols. London, 1830-52.

STEELE, ROBERT. *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations,* 1485-1714. *Volume I. England and Wales.* Oxford, 1910.

STRYPE, JOHN. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker.* Clarendon Edition. 2 vols. 1821.

STURGE, CHARLES. *Cuthbert Tunstall, Churchman, Scholar, Statesman, Administrator.* London and New York, [1938].

THOMPSON, W. D. J. CARGILL. "Who Wrote *The Supper of the Lord?*" *Harvard Theological Review,* LIII (1960), 70-91.

TOWNLEY, J. *Illustrations of Biblical Literature, ... from the Earliest Period to the Present Century; including Biographical Notices of Translators.* 3 vols. London, 1821.

TYNDALE, WILLIAM. *The exposition of the fyrste epistle of seynt Jhon.* [Antwerp], 1531. (*S.T.C.* 24443)

– *The obedience of a christen man.* [Antwerp], 1528. (*S.T.C.* 24446)

– *The parable of the wicked mammon.* [Antwerp], 1529. (*S.T.C.* 24454)

– *The practyse of prelates.* [Antwerp?], 1530. (*S.T.C.* 24465)

– *The Prayer and Complaint of the Plowman unto Christ.* [Antwerp, 1531?] (*S.T.C.* 20036)

– *The souper of the Lorde.* [Antwerp?], 1533. (*S.T.C.* 24468)

TYNDALE, WILLIAM, trans. *The fyrst boke of Moses called Genesis,* [etc.] [Antwerp?], 1530. (*S.T.C.* 2350)

VENN, JOHN and J. A. *Alumni Cantabrigienses. A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates, and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge from Earliest Times to* 1900. *Part I, From the Earliest Times to* 1751. 4 vols. Cambridge, 1922-27.

The Victoria Histories of the Counties of England: Bedfordshire. 3 vols. London, 1904-12.

The Victoria Histories of the Counties of England: Hertfordshire. 4 vols. London, 1902-14.

WARREN, FREDERICK E. *The Sarum Missal in English, Newly Translated.* (*The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers,* ed. VERNON STALEY. Vols. VIII and IX.) 2 vols. London, 1911.

WELLER, EMIL O. *Repertorium typographicum,* [etc.]. 2 vols. Nördlingen, 1864.

WESTCOTT, B. F. *A General View of the History of the English Bible.* 3rd ed., rev. by W. A. WRIGHT. New York, 1927.

WILKINS, DAVID, ed. *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae.* 4 vols. London, 1737.

WRIOTHESLEY, CHARLES. *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors.* Edited by WILLIAM DOUGLAS HAMILTON. (Camden Society Publications, New Series, Vols. XI and XX.) 2 vols. London, 1875, 1877.

ZWINGLI, HULDREICH. *Christianae Fidei Expositio.* Zurich, 1531.

– *Complanationis Isaiae prophetae, foetura prima.* Zurich, 1529.

– *Complanationis Ieremiae Prophetae, foctura prima.* Zurich [1529].

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL CITATIONS

Exodus *Page*
15 : 4–8 126–27
20 : 17 190

Psalms
1 : 1–6 57–58
2 : 1, 2 134
22 : 6 59
23 : 2 130
27 : 1, 5 132–33
32 : 4 58
42 : 12 59
46 : 8 133
62 : 10 58
67 : 6, 7 131
76 : 8 58
91 : 5 59
93 : 4 131
95 : 1–7 263–64
102 : 6, 7 131–32
107 : 30 133
119 : 92, 93 130
130 : 7 133
147 : 10 59

Proverbs
8 : 24 140
10 : 27–11 : 7 266
15 : 2, 17 141

Proverbs *Page*
16 : 18 142
20 : 14 141–42
30 : 13–15 140
30 : 18, 19 142
31 : 8, 9 140
31 : 17-19 140–41

Ecclesiastes
7 : 27–29 143
9 : 10–18 266–67

Song of Solomon
6 : 10 108

Isaiah
3 : 18–23 72
14 : 3–5 73
35 : 1–10 264–65
38 : 14 72
40 : 4, 6 72–73
40 : 10 71
53 : 5, 7 107
57 : 20, 21 70–71
59 : 1 67
60 : 6 73
64 : 1–4 100
65 : 2–4 82

Jeremiah *Page*
3 : 11 121
3 : 22 121
8 : 5 121
8 : 10–11 124–25
8 : 14–15 125
8 : 22 124
10 : 1–13 265–66
13 : 23 121
17 : 6, 12 122
31 : 3 121, 123
31 : 7–8 123–24
50 : 23, 35 120

Lamentations
1 : 20 126
3 : 24–26 126

Ezekiel
1 : 10–14 188–90
18 : 20, 25 190–91
36 : 24 190

Daniel
4 : 4–17 240–42
6 : 16–24 267
12 : 1–13 242–43

Amos
9 : 15 190

Jonah
2 : 2, 6 107–108
2 : 1–10 264

Matthew *Page*
6 : 25 269
7 : 18 156
8 : 18 156
11 : 19 269
11 : 28 65
15 : 25 161
16 : 18 157
22 : 23–32 161
27 : 11 269

Mark
1 : 11 161
2 : 24 156
8 : 2 157
8 : 12 269
14 : 23 269
15 : 40 159

Luke
2 : 14 157
2 : 19 159
7 : 30, 49 269
8 : 46 269
9 : 20 157
9 : 51 269
11 : 4 160
11 : 13 269
12 : 37 155
15 : 5 269
16 : 8 269
16 : 10 155
16 : 13 270

Luke Page
16 : 22, 23 158
17 : 20 157, 270
19 : 9 270
19 : 48 159–60

John
1 : 21 159
3 : 16 270
3 : 36 155
5 : 27 270
5 : 45 158
6 : 15 155
6 : 23 159
7 : 52 270
10 : 36 156
12 : 25 159
13 : 3 270
15 : 18 270
18 : 38 270
21 : 21 270

Acts
3 : 16 270
4 : 26 270
4 : 32 270
5 : 34 270
6 : 1, 2 160
6 : 9 157
7 : 44 270
8 : 32 270
9 : 24 155
11 : 9 270

Acts Page
13 : 2 271
23 : 11 160
24 : 15 271

Romans
5 : 7 160
8 : 3 158
9 : 33 271
12 : 2 271
12 : 13 155
12 : 19 271
13 : 9 271
14 : 4 271

I Corinthians
2 : 14 271
4 : 16 158
10 : 16 158
11 : 5 160
14 : 22, 24 160
14 : 40 271

II Corinthians
9 : 10 271
10 : 10 271

Ephesians
1 : 6 271

I Timothy
5 : 22 271

II Timothy *Page*
4 : 7 271

Titus
1 : 5 159
3 : 5 271

Philemon
1 : 21 156

Hebrews
1 : 3 158
11 : 21 271
13 : 21 158

I Peter *Page*
2 : 20 272
5 : 1 159

I John
1 : 1, 2, 8, 10 272
2 : 2 158
3 : 16 272
5 : 16 157

Jude
1 : 12 158

Revelation
22 : 2 159

GENERAL INDEX

Act Abolishing Diversity of Opinions, An ("The Six Articles"), 202, 205, 206, 222, 224, 228, 248, 250
Acworth, Thomas, 255
"Aleph, Iohan," pseud., *see* Joye, George, s.v. Psalter (1530)
Anabaptists, 95
Annates, Act of, 87
Anne of Cleves, 208
Antwerp, 35, 40, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 148, 205, 228
Apology of Sir T. More, see More, Thomas
Apology ... to satisfy W. Tindale, see Joye
Argentine, *see* Strassburg
Arthur, Thomas, 26, 27, 28, 37, 38, 40, 42, 45
Articles Devised by the King's Highness Majesty to Stablish Christian Quietness and Unity ("The Ten Articles"), 201
Ashwell, Herts, 255-58, 259
Ashwell, John, prior of Newnham, 19, 38, 39, 44, 57, 78–81, 85, 112, 232
Askew, Anne, 245–46
Audley, Thomas, 91, 92
Augsburg, Diet of, 228–29

Bainham, James, 85
Bale, John, P. of Ossory, 17, 24, 27, 93, 228, 246, 247, 259; his *Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum summarium*, 136, 219–21, 261–2
Baptism, 225–26
Baptist College, Bristol, 69, 148
Barlow, Jerome, 48, 49
Barnes, Robert, 23, 24, 25, 27, 33, 34, 35, 89, 175–76, 203, 216, 248; charged with heresy and recants, 28–30; imprisoned, 36, 37; flees to the Continent, 49; his *Supplication unto Henry the Eighth*, 85; Barnes, Tyndale, and Joye sought by authorities in Brabant, 193–95; disputes with Gardiner on justification, 207–209; preaches defiant sermon, 210; attainted and executed, 211; his views defended by Joye, 211–18; his writings condemned, 246–47
Barton, Elizabeth, 110–11
Basle, 258
Bayfield, Richard, 24, 27, 83
Beaton, David, cardinal abp. of St. Andrews, 49
Beauchamp, Margaret, 17
Beaufort, Lady Margaret, 17
"Beckenth, Balthasar," pseud., *see* Keyser, Martin de
Becon, Thomas, 246–47
Bedford, 17
Benet Hall, *see* Cambridge University
Berde, Johan, *alias* Johan Salpho, 40
Bergen-op-Zoom, 92, 148
Berghen, Adrien van, 51
Berthelet, Thomas, 246
"Beuchame, Lewis," pseud., *see* Joye, George, s.v. *A very godly defense.*
Bible, English:
  Coverdale (1535): 58–60, 72–74, 121, 122, 123, 124–25, 127, 132–33, 138, 140–43 159, 197, 239, 241–42, 244
  Matthew (1537): 149, 159, 187, 198, 239, 294
  Great (1539): 71, 121, 198–99, 240, 244, 248

Bible, English:—*cont.*
  Geneva (1560): 121, 133, 159, 244
  Bishops' (1568): 121
  Douai (1610): 121
  Authorized (1611): 71, 74, 121, 133, 156, 157, 158, 159, 191, 243, 244 269, 270, 271
  Revised (1880): 244
  Revised Standard (1946–52): 269, 271, 272
  See also, Tyndale and Joye, s.v. New Testament
Bible, German (Luther), 28, 123, 244
Bible, Latin: Vulgate, 21, 53, 70, 139, 140, 154, 157, 158–59, 166, 188, 190, 244; Zurich, 239, 240, 242, 244
Bible, Swiss-German (Zurich), 74, 123, 125, 127, 132, 143–44
Billendorp, Helbert, 34–35
Bilney, Thomas, 23, 27, 29, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 45, 83
Bishops' Book, *see Institution of a Christian Man*
Blunham, Bedfordshire, 254–58
Bodleian Library, 69
Boleyn, Anne, 54, 67, 87, 91–92, 101, 117, 128, 197, 201
Bonner, Edmund, bp. of London, 136, 217, 246, 248, 249, 258
Bradford, Ralph, 27
Brinkelow, Henry, 213, 217; his *Lamentation of a Christian against the city of London*, 212
British Museum, 118; Grenville Library, 148, 154
Brunfels, Otto, his *Precationes Biblicae*, 53, 65, 99, 134
Bucer, Martin, 48, 70, 74, 142; his Latin Psalter (signed "Aretius Felinus"), 53, 55, 56, 129, 131; *Historia Supplicii Domini Jesu*, 64, 67ⁿ
"Bug Bibles", 59
Bugenhagen, John, 33–35, 45ⁿ
Bullinger, Heinrich, 254
Burgoyne, William, 19
Burham, William, 256
"Burying of the Mass", 48
Byddell, John, 128, 135, 174–75, 199, 200
Byrt, Johan, 112–13

Calais, 47, 195–96
Cambridge University, 20, 23–27, 105, 206, 208, 217; Library, 69, 118, 129, 174; Benet Hall (Corpus Christi), 25, 27; Christ's College, 17–18, 20; Gonville and Caius, 25, 27; Jesus, 27; King's, 20, 25; Pembroke Hall, 25; Peterhouse, 19, 25, 39, 40, 44, 113, 232; Queen's, 20, 25, 26, 256; St. John's, 17–18, 20, 25, 26; Trinity, 20; Trinity Hall, 27
Canewdon, Essex, 256
Capon, William, 30, 41
Catherine of Aragon, 37, 54, 67, 91, 101, 102, 110, 117
Celibacy, sacerdotal, 39, 80, 222-25
Charles V, 37, 101, 206, 228, 229, 245
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 137
"Christen Father and his stobborne Sonne," 48
Christianae Fidei Expositio, see Zwingli
Christ's College, *see* Cambridge University
Chrysostom upon Genesis, 30
Clark, John, 26
Clement VII, 101, 117
Cochlaeus, Johann, 147, 229
Cock, Simon, 51
Coke, John, 87, 96–97
Collins, George, 194
Compendious Sum of the Christian Religion, A, see Joye
Complanationis Ieremiae Prophetae, see Zwingli

Complanationis Isaiae Prophetae, see Zwingli
Confutation of Tyndale's Answer, see More
Conjecturae de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi, see Osiander
Conjectures of the end of the world, The, see Joye
Constable, Archibald, 154
Constantine, George, 24, 49, 83–84
Contrary ... Consultation: that adulterers ought to be punished with death, A, see Joye
Cotsforde, Thomas, 230
Cotton, Henry, 136
Coverdale, Myles, 15, 23, 27, 49, 86, 134, 198, 199, 203, 217, 246, 247, 248, 250, *see also* Bible, English
Cranmer, Thomas, abp. of Canterbury, 23, 27, 67, 88, 91, 95, 96, 100, 101, 110, 195, 197, 198, 209, 245
Crome, Edward, 27, 83
Cromwell, Thomas, 68, 87, 88, 97, 101, 102, 103, 128, 193, 195, 196, 198, 202, 206, 211, 233

David's Psalter, see Joye
Day, George, 24, 26
Day, John, 244
De lapsis in ecclesiam recipiendis, see Foxe, John
De non plectendis morte adulteris Consultatio, see Foxe, John
Defense of the Marriage of Priests, The, see Joye
Defensio Coniugii Sacerdotum, see Melanchthon
Dialogue of Sir T. More, see More, Thomas
Disputation of Purgatory, see Frith
Draconites, John, 235, 242
Dudley, Robert, earl of Warwick and duke of Northumberland, 249, 257, 258
Dusgate, Thomas, 24, 85

Eadie, John, 123
Eck, Johann, 229
Edmunds, John, 19, 40
Edward VI, 248, 258
Emperor, Martin, *see* Keyser, Martin de
Enchiridion, see Luther
Enchiridion Psalmorum, see Zwingli
Endhoven, Christopher van, 36, 50, 68, 69, 118, 148; employs Joye to correct Tyndale's New Testament, 149–51; widow of, 154, 220, 221
"Epistles", Old Testament, *see* Old Testament "Epistles"
Erasmus, Desiderius, 25, 28, 20–21, 70, 110, 249
Exposition of Daniel the prophet, The, see Joye

Farman, Thomas, 27, 30, 32n
Felinus, Aretius, *see* Bucer
Fish, Simon, 49
Fisher, John, bp. of Rochester, 25, 29, 30, 78, 101, 110, 117, 232, 233, 251
Fox, Edward, bp. of Hereford, 24, 27, 104–105; writes Cromwell on Joye's behalf, 195–96, 199; 233
Foxe, Francis, 55, 62
Foxe, John, 16, 100, 136, 194, 217, 245, 252–54, 258; his *De lapsis in ecclesiam recipiendis*, 252; *De non plectendis morte adulteris consultatio*, 252
Francis I, 101
Frankfort, 258
Frith, John, 24, 27, 49, 77, 86, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 99, 104–105, 109, 169; his *Disputation of Purgatory*, 78; imprisoned, 88; his views on transubstantiation, 88–90; executed for

heresy, 100–101; praised by Joye, 178; his writings condemned, 246-47
Fruitful Treatise of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, A, see Joye
Fry, Francis, 163n
Fuller, Thomas, 259

Gairdner, James, 97
Gardiner, Germayne, 109, 104–105
Gardiner, Stephen, bp. of Winchester, 24, 27, 88, 100, 202, 203, 228, 245, 248, 249, 251, 258; befriends Joye, 30, 38, 44; controversy with Joye over justification, 205–18; attacked by Joye, 221, 223–34, 238, 239
Garret, Thomas, 210, 214
Gascoigne, Sir William, 41–42, 43, 44, 232
Geneva, 258
George Joye Confuteth Winchester's False Articles, see Joye
Gerard, Thomas, *see* Garret
Godfrey, Thomas, 60, 135–38, 199, 200
Gold, Henry, 18
Gonville Hall, *see* Cambridge University
Grafton, Richard, 84, 198
Grapheus, Johannes, 51, 75n; his *Summa Totius Sacrae Scripturae*, 200
Grave, Nicholas de, 51
Grenville Library, *see* British Museum
Grey, Sir Henry, 255
Grey, Lady Jane, 258

Haeghen, Gottfried van der, 51, 110, 173
Halle, Edward, 84
Hamburg, 49
Hamilton, Patrick, 49
Hampton, Court, 209
Harman, Richard, 35, 87, 128
Harmsworth, Sir Leicester, 136
Heath, Nicholas, 24
Henry VIII, 19, 25, 34, 35, 37, 49, 54, 61, 67, 68, 87, 91, 100, 101, 102, 110, 117, 118, 196, 197, 198, 201, 206, 209, 222, 245, 248, 250
Hereford, Use of, 184
Heretical books, 26, 30, 33–36, 48, 50–51, 61, 77, 83, 85, 86, 92, 104, 215, 246–48
Hill, William, 95, 98, 99
Hilles, T., 36
Hilsey, John, 24
Historia Supplicii Domini Jesu, see Bucer
Hitton, Thomas, 51, 53, 60–61, 63–64
"Hoff, Ubright", pseud., 220
Holbeach, Henry, 255
Homilies, First Book of, 248–49
Hoochstraten, Johannes, 51, 54, 74–75n
Hooper, John, bp. of Gloucester and Worcester, 249, 258
Hortulus Animae, see Joye
Howard, Thomas, duke of Norfolk, 202, 224
Humberston Abbey, Lincolnshire, 19, 44

Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum summarium, see Bale, John
Image of Love, The, 34
In Danielem Prophetam commentarius, see Melanchthon
Injunctions, Royal, of 1536, 197
Injunctions, Visitation, of 1547, 248
Institution of a Christian Man, The, ("The Bishops' Book"), 202
Isaiah, Prayer of, 65, 95, 98–100

Jeremiah the Prophet, see Joye
Jerome, William, 210
Jesus College, *see* Cambridge
Jonah, Prayer of, 65, 106, 107–108
Jonas, Justus, 222

Joye, George:
(1) *Life to 1527.* Character, 15, 16; birthplace, 17; at Cambridge, 18–32; accused of heretical views by Prior Ashwell, 37–40; summoned to London by Cardinal Wolsey, 40–44; flees from England, 45
(2) *First Period of Exile, 1527–1535.* Settles in Antwerp, 47–50; first meeting with Tyndale, 50; replies to the charges of Prior Ashwell, 78–82; marriage, 52, 86, 205; rumoured to be preparing translation of whole Bible, 92; alleged author of tract on the Lord's Supper (probably by Tyndale), 93–94; correspondence with Hugh Latimer, 94–99; Stephen Vaughan's favorable report of him to Cromwell, 102–104; Germayne Gardiner's adverse report, 104–106; his share in *The Mystic Sweet Rosary*, 106–108; controversy with Sir Thomas More, 109n–113; employed by Endhovens to correct Tyndale's New Testament, 149–55; quarrel with Tyndale, 162, 165–81; flees from Brabant to Calais, 194–96; is befriended by Edward Fox, 196–97; returns to England, 197
(3) *Second Period of Exile, 1540–1547.* Flees to the Continent, 203; residence in or near Antwerp, 205; controversy with Bishop Gardiner, 206–18, 222–24; his writings suppressed, 246–48; returns to England, 250
(4) *Last Years in England, 1547–1553.* Possibly employed by London Printers, 250; given living of Blunham in Bedfordshire, 254–55; of Ashwell in Hertfordshire, 255–57; death, 258–59; Thomas Fuller's tribute, 259.
(5) *Translations from the Bible.* The Lost Primer, 51–54, 83, 85; Psalter of 1530, 54–60, 85, 247; *Hortulus Animae*, 60–67, 70, 83, 95, 98, 99, 106–107, 113, 135; *Prophet Isaiah*, 68–74, 100, 106, 107, 134, 248; *Jeremiah the Prophet*, 118–27, 247; *Lamentations*, 125–26; Psalter of 1534, 127–34, 247; *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes*, 135–143, 247; revision of Tyndale's New Testament, first edition, 149–60; second edition, 170–71; Old Testament "Epistles", 138, 183–92; *Daniel the Prophet*, 235–243, 247
(6) *Doctrinal and Polemical Writings. The Letters* [of] *John Ashwell ... with the Answers of the Said George*, 38–44, 78–82; *The Subversion of More's False Foundation*, 109–113, 247; *An Apology to Satisfy W*[*illiam*] *Tyndale*, 50, 99, 174–81, 247; *A Compendious Sum of the Very Christian Religion*, 200–201; *George Joye Confuteth Winchester's False Articles*, 207, 210–14; *The Refutation of the Bishop of Winchester's Dark Declaration*, 207, 215–17; *A Very Godly Defense ...* [of] *the Marriage of Priests* (signed "lewes beuchame"), 219, 220, 222–23; *The Defense of the Marriage of Priests* (signed "James Sawtry"), 219, 221, 223–25, 248; *A Fruitful Treatise of Baptism and the Lord's Supper* (anonymous, doubtfully by Joye), 219, 221, 225–27; *Our Savior Jesus Christ Hath Not Overcharged His Church with Many Ceremonies* (Anonymous), 219,

Joye George:—*cont.*
220, 227–28; *The Reckoning and Declaration of the Faith and Belief of Huldreich Zwingli* (Anonymous), 219, 220, 228–30; *The Unity and Schism of the Old Church*, 230–31; *A Present Consolation for the Sufferers of Persecution for Righteousness*, 231–32, 247; *The Conjectures of the End of the World*, 251–52; *A Contrary to a Certain Man's Consultation: That Adulterers Ought To Be Punished with Death*, 253–54.
Joye, George, the younger, 205, 258, 260n
Jugge, Richard, 250, 251, 253
Justification by faith, 39, 80–81, 201, 211–17

Keyser, Martin de, 51, 55, 61, 68, 69, 74, 78, 83, 106, 129, 167, 186
King's College, *see* Cambridge

Lamentation of a Christian against the city of London, see Brinkelow, Henry
Lambert, John, 24, 27
Larke, John, 113
Latimer, family of, 17
Latimer, Hugh, bp. of Worcester, 23, 27, 29, 62, 68, 85, 97, 98, 99, 100, 162, 217, 254, 255, 258; correspondence with George Joye, 94–99
Leo X, 25
Letters [of] *John Ashwell, see* Joye
Lipse, 220
Longland, John, bp. of Lincoln, 25, 29, 40, 41, 43, 44, 78, 112, 113, 232
Lord's Supper, 88–90, 93–94, 196, 225–26
Lucys, of Charlcote, 252
Luft, Hans, 51
Luther, Martin, 16, 23, 25, 28, 33, 35, 77, 95, 229, *see also* Bible, German

Magdalen College, Oxford, 252
Maid of Kent, *see* Barton, Elizabeth
Marburg, 47, 49, 51
Marriage of priests, *see* Celibacy, sacerdotal
Marshall Primer, 128, 199
Mary Tudor, Queen, 230, 258
"Matthew, Thomas", pseud., *see* Rogers, John
Maurice, duke of Saxony, 236
Melanchthon, Philip, 16, 74, 89, 135n, 142, 220, 222, 235, 236; his *Defensio coniugii sacerdotum*, 219–20, 222–23; *In Danielem prophetam commentarius*, 235–36; *Sententiae Salamonis*, 139–40
Monasteries, Suppression of, 196–97, 202
Monmouth, Humphrey, 87
More, Sir Thomas, 16, 34, 49, 54, 77, 78, 81, 83, 92–93, 101, 117, 120, 196, 219, 232, 233, 251; comments on the lost primer, 52, 57; on the *Hortulus Animae*, 64; interrogates George Constantine concerning Joye and Tyndale, 84; his *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*, 64, 85, 87, 109; examines John Frith, 88–89, 97; his *Apology*, 109; his charges answered by Joye, 109–13; his criticism of Tyndale's New Testament, 158; his opinions on the state of the "souls departed", 176–77
Morice, Ralph, 245
"Mors, Roderigo", pseud., *see* Brinkelow, Henry
Moses, Song of, 126–27
Mozley, J. F., 74, 79, 97, 123, 136, 141, 142, 185–86, 219–21
Mystik sweet rosary of the faythful soule, The, 106–107

Natares, Edmund, 29
Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, A ("The King's Book"), 216
Nevill, family of, 17
New Learning, 23, 25, 27, 31n, 77, 87
Newnham Priory, Bedford, 19, 38, 39
Nicolson, James, 197
Nix, Richard, bp. of Norwich, 25, 29, 61, 83
Northampton, 49
Nuremburg, 250

Oecolampadius, John, 30, 235
Old God and the New, The, see Watt, Joachim van
Old Testament "Epistles," 138, 167, 183–92
Ortulus Anime, see Joye
Osiander, Andreas, 252; his *Coniecturae de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi,* 250–51
Our Savior Jesus Christ Hath Not Overcharged His Church, see Joye
Oxford University, 67, 105

Paget, William, 212
Parable of the Wicked Mammon, see Tyndale
Parker, Matthew, abp. of Canterbury, 24, 26, 27
Paton, George, 154
Paul's Cross, 148, 209, 210, 232, 247, 248
Peasant's War, 33
Pelicanus, Conrad, 235, 239
Pembroke Hall, *see* Cambridge
Peterhouse, *see* Cambridge
Peto, William, 91, 102, 103, 104
Phillips, Henry, 193–95
Power, Gabriel, 256
Prayer Book, first Edwardine, 249; second Edwardine, 250
Precationes Biblicae, see Brunfels
Present Consolation for the Sufferers of Persecution, A, see Joye
Priesthood, 78–80, 81
Primer in English (lost), *see* Joye
Prophet Isaiah, see Joye
Proverbs of Solomon, see Joye
Psalter of David, 1530, *see* Joye
Purser, Dick, 112

Queen's College, *see* Cambridge

Rastell, John, 78
Rastell, William, 104, 109
Raynolde, Thomas, 244
Reckoning and Declaration of the Faith of Huldreich Zwingli, The, see Joye
"Rede me and be nott wrothe," 48
Redman, Robert, 134, 135
Refutation of the Bishop of Winchester's Dark Declaration, The, see Joye
Renhold, Bedfordshire, 17, 19, 40
Repeal, Act of, (1547), 250
Reppes, William, bp. of Norwich, 223, 224
Resurrection, 94, 95, 161–62, 166–67, 168–73, 176–81
Ridley, Nicholas, bp. of London, 24, 26, 217, 249, 258; gives living of Ashwell, Herts, to Joye, 255
Rogers, John, 24, 26, 149, 187, 198, 199, 258
Roye, William, 24, 35, 37, 48, 49, 147, 246, 247
Rudde, Richard, 259

Sadler, John, 35
St Germain, Christopher, 89
St John, Sir John, 17–18
St John's College, *see* Cambridge
St Martin, Ludgate, 256
St Mary the Great, Cambridge, 25
St Mary Spital, 210

St Paul's Cathedral Library, 148
Salpho, John, *see* Berde Johan
Salphobury Manor, 17, 40
Sandeford, Barnard, 255, 256
Sarum, Use of, 134, 154, 164
"Sawtry, James," pseud., *see* Joye, s.v. *Defense of the marriage of priests*
Schmalkaldic League, 222
Sententiae Salomonis, see Melanchthon
Seres, William, 244
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, 248, 249, 250, 257
Seymour, Jane, 201, 202
Shaxton, Nicholas, bp. of Salisbury, 24, 27
Shirton, Robert, 30
"Six Articles," *see Act Abolishing Diversity of Opinion*
Smith, Henry, 97, 99
Smith, Robert, 18
Smith, Simon, 27, 49
Smithfield, 203, 246
Souls departed, *see* Resurrection
Stafford, George, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31
Steelyard, The, 33, 34
Stokesley, John, bp. of London, 77, 83, 85, 88, 89, 101, 232, 233
Strassburg, 37, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55
Subversion of More's False Foundation, The, see Joye
Succession, Act of, 117
Summa totius sacrae scripturae, see Grapheus, Johannes
Supplication unto Henry the Eighth, see Barnes

Taverner, Richard, 27
Taverner, Thomas, 198
"Ten Articles," *see Articles Devised by the King's Highness*, etc.
Theobald, Thomas, 195
Thirlby, Thomas, bp. of Westminster, of Norwich, of Ely, 24
Thixtel, John, 26, 62
Tonge, Roger, 255
Tracy, Richard, 246
Transubstantiation, *see* Lord's Supper
"Treacle Bible," 124
Trinity College, *see* Cambridge
Trinity Hall, *see* Cambridge
"Troost, Jan," pseud., 222
Tunstall, Cuthbert, bp. of London and of Durham, 28, 34, 35, 36, 61, 77, 84, 148, 258
Turner, William, 217, 246, 247
Tyball, John, 36
Tyndale, William, 16, 55, 74, 84, 85, 86, 94, 95, 98, 99, 104, 105, 195, 246, 247; his work and Joye's compared, 15; residence at Cambridge, 23; first meeting with Joye, 50; warns Frith of Joye's extreme views, 88–90, 97; alludes to Joye's project for translating the whole Bible, 92; quarrel with Joye, 162, 165–81; apprehended and executed for heresy, 193–94; his translation of the New Testament, 27–28, 34, 35, 36, 37, 61, 64, 68, 106, 125, 128, 147–51, 154–60, 183–92; of Jonah, 68–69; of Genesis, 128; of the Pentateuch, 53, 54, 55, 126–27; his share in the Matthew Bible, 149, 198; *Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, 49; *Practice of Prelates*, 68; *An Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, 77–78, 79; *Exposition of the First Epistle of St John*, 83, 177–78; *The Supper of the Lord*, 93–94, 114n

Uniformity, First Act of, 249; Second Act of, 250
Unity and Schism of the Old Church, The, see Joye
Unwritten verities, 109, 110, 120

Vaughan, Stephen, 68, 69, 79, 84, 102, 103, 128
Vermütung von den letzen Zeiten, see Osiander
Very Godly Defense [of] *the Marriage of Priests, A*, *see* Joye
Vilvorde, 194

Warham, William, abp. of Canterbury, 61, 87, 148
Watt, Joachim van, his *The Old God and the New*, 174–75
Wayte, Edmund, 17
West, Nicholas, bp. of Ely, 25, 44, 232, 233
Westcott, B. F., 123
Whitchurch, Edward, 60, 198
White Horse Inn, Cambridge, 25–27, 31–32n
Wittenburg, 47, 49, 51
Wolsey, Thomas, cardinal abp. of York, 25, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 48, 54, 67–68, 91, 208, 232, 233
Worms, 35, 37, 47, 49
Wycliffe, John, 126
Wyer, Richard, 230

Zwingli, Huldreich, 16, 70, 74, 90, 99, 118, 119, 123, 129, 131, 132, 142, 220; his *Complanationis Ieremiae Prophetae*, 120–22, 143n; *Complanationis Isaiae Prophetae*, 70–71, 76n; *Enchiridion Psalmorum*, 129, 132; *Christianae Fidei Expositio*, 228–30, *see also* Bible, Swiss-German (Zurich)

DATE DUE

[redacted]			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BW2380 .J88B9
George Joye, 1495?-1553; a cahpter in

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library

1 1012 00016 9401